

THE
DIVINE and HUMAN
NATURES

United in the
Person of JESUS CHRIST.

Whereon is laid
The Foundation for his receiving divine
ATTRIBUTIONS.

Demonstrated by Scripture, and no Ways re-
pugnant to Sound Reason.

In a calm Defence of an Examination of *William Brom-
field's* Principles, with Regard to the Conception and
Mission of *Jesus Christ*, publish'd by him as the Faith of
a true Christian, and the primitive Quakers Faith.

By HENTON BROWN.

1 Joh. v. 20. *And we know that the Son of God is come, and hath
given us an Understanding, that we may know him that is true:
And we are in him that is true, even in his Son Jesus Christ; This
is the true God and eternal Life.*

Rev. xxii. 16. *I Jesus have sent mine Angel to testify unto you these
Things in the Churches; I am the Root and the Offspring of David,
and the bright and Morning Star.*

L O N D O N:

Printed for T. WARNER, at the Black-Boy in
Pater-Noster-Row.

851





THE PREFACE.

Christian Reader,



ALTHOUGH I love not tedious Preambles, which often times tire the Reader's Patience at the first setting out, yet I find it necessary for thy Information, to make this Preface somewhat longer than I am inclin'd to do.

Know then, that sometime since a Pamphlet was published, under the specious Title of the Faith of a true Christian, and the primitive Quakers Faith, subscribed by William Bromfield, in which he endeavoured to impose a Faith upon the People called Quakers, by insinuating, that the Doctrine concerning Jesus Christ, he therein had publish'd, was the Faith of the primitive Quakers.

Which Doctrine was, that Jesus Christ (who suffered for the Redemption of Mankind) was only the real Son of Joseph and Mary, was conceived by the common and natural Act of Generation between them; that he was only a Prophet like unto Moses, influenc'd by the Spirit of God; and that

he was no otherwise the Son of God, than as he was conceived by the Prediction of the Holy Ghost, as was Abraham's Son Isaac.

Upon reading such erroneous and unscriptural Principles, which denied in so gross a Manner the Divinity of Christ Jesus, and which so evidently subvert the Doctrine of the Scriptures, sap the Foundation of the Christian Religion, destroy the End of his Death and Sufferings, dissipate our Hopes of so glorious a Sacrifice, dispel our Belief of so gracious an Advocate, and, in fine, constitute him only as a Man suffering as an Example of Humility to the Will of God.

I say, upon reading such pernicious Principles, a godly Zeal raised in my Mind a Detestation and Abhorrence thereof; and also knowing right well his Insinuation, that it was the primitive Quakers Faith, was absolutely unjust, I resolved in Pursuance of an Obligation which I thought my Duty, briefly to review the Authority he brought for the Support of them, and also shew his Unfairness to impose a Faith upon a People who had not given any Instances of their holding such Principles which tend to the Subversion of the Christian Faith, which Book I entitled, *An Examination of William Bromfield's Principles, with Regard to the Conception and Mission of Jesus Christ.*

And although I used him with good Manners and Modesty, suitable to the Solidity of the Debate, and with strict Justice, with Respect to the particular Matters I quoted from his Pamphlet, for the Truth of which, I appeal to those judicious Persons who have read his Book, and my Examination;

The P R E F A C E.

5

Yet, this William Bromfield, my Adversary, hath publish'd a Reply to my Examination, in which he hath done me much Injustice, by endeavouring to stamp those odious Characters upon me, which no Demerit of mine to him hath ever deserved.

I cannot help thinking, That that Reader who reads truly for Information, and a right Understanding of the Difference between contending Parties, will come to this Conclusion, That William Bromfield hath used me in such a Manner, as very much unbecomes the Seriousness of the Subject, and the Gravity of his Years.

For as he begins in his Preface, so diversly in the other Parts of his Book, doth he charge me with Lying, false Charges, calumnious Reports, false Quotations, wrong Representations; with Idolatry, and Blasphemy in the highest; that I am the Champion of Antichrist, of the Apostates, and Babylonish Priests; that my Tongue is no Slander, and full of deadly Poison; with many other scandalous and unjust Insinuations, of which I am entirely innocent, and hope to make it fully appear to the Judicious, in the subsequent Matters of this Defence.

It is an Argument of the Badness of a Man's Cause, when he shall with Inveteracy be led to personal Reflections; but such never is an Ornament to a wise Man, or a Christian: Meekness, Gentleness, and mild Arguments, are the best Means to overcome an Adversary, and may sooner reduce him to our Way of Thinking. And if I were to follow the Example of my Opponent, I doubt not he is conscious I might find Matter sufficient to return at him in the same Manner; but as I judge
it

it foreign to Disputes, and highly improper in religious ones, so I shall wave it. Had Wm. Bromfield pursued this Path, it would have added more Honour to his Age and his Undertaking. But the contrary is so obvious in his Reply, and built upon such false Foundations, that the judicious Reader would find on Examination, that his own Evidence would be sufficient to convict him; nor should I have made any Rejoinder to my Examination on that Score, but that his fresh Attacks upon the Christian Doctrine made it necessary, and at the same time gives me an Opportunity of clearing my self from his malicious Aspersions.

Although there doth not appear to me to be any better Proofs brought by him for the Defence of his Doctrine, than in his former Book, nor hath he judiciously considered any one Testimony of our primitive Friends, brought by me to evince their Faith, nor fairly reviewed one Scripture Authority, nor answered one Argument of mine in his whole Book; but contains a Rhapsody of Words, for which he seems not to have any regular Ideas, a promiscuous Crowd of Charges, for which he hath no Foundation, a mere Heap of Inconsistency to amuse the Credulous, and insinuate himself into the Favour of the Unwary, and others who are prejudic'd against the Persons and Principles of the People called Quakers.

In Opposition, therefore, to this Invective Reply of William Bromfield's, I offer this calm Defence of my Examination, that the World may see whether I have given him the Occasion in so heated a Humour to say, he was obliged to detect this hot-headed Boy. But if Passion and Raillery be Indication of the Hotness of a Man's Head, then it will

will not be unfair to conclude, that he who is most in the Practice thereof, is the most hot-headed; and if I have but common Impartiality allow'd me, I am satisfied that this Epithet which he designed for me, must be hung over his own Head; and then judge which is most dishonourable, a hot-headed Boy, or a hot-headed old Man.

But however, as much as he supposes me a Boy in this Page, my Age in Life with him is soon alter'd; for in a Page or two following, I am grown from a Boy to a Man; which is strange, unless William Bromfield had made a greater Distance of Time in the Writing those Pages than it can be supposed he did, which seems not to be the Effect of a cool Head.

And notwithstanding he hath given me very just Occasion, as well as Opportunity, to expose his Weakness and Folly, as well as his repeated Contradictions, yet I desire not to be like him, bitter and envious, but modest and impartial, and therefore shall consider his Reply with Calmness and Temper, intending this Defence more for the Information of those into whose Hands this may come, than to humour William Bromfield in an Answer to his silly Pamphlet.

I cannot well omit taking Notice, (of that Part of his Preface concerning my Application to the Meeting for Approbation of my Book,) that I cannot see it any Scandal to a Profession, for any Member to publish a Vindication of his Principles against the Insinuation of an Adversary, although he may not have the Consent of the Meeting, who is supposed to have an Authority to approve or disapprove such an Undertaking: For I assert it as much the Right of every particular Member to write
in

in Vindication of his Principles, as any select Body whatsoever; his Principles are his Property, the which he hath an indubitable Right to defend, provided he clears the Society from any Imputation on that Account, which in my Preface is evident I did. But if I had presum'd to publish any System, as the Faith of a Society, without their Knowledge and Consent, and had sent it into the World as their Act, as William Bromfield hath done, then indeed I might justly have been charg'd with acting contrary to common Justice, and so have been a Scandal to any religious Profession.

I shall not take any Notice of what he offers in his Preface as Proofs for his Doctrine, he having so many Times repeated the same, or to the like Purpose, in several other Parts of his Book, and is so full of Tautologies and Repetitions, that of Necessity I must be obliged to reduce the Debate to some Order, or it may be difficult for the Reader to form a Judgment; and this I shall do without any Injustice to him or his Cause.

The particular Matters in his Book which I opposed, were,

First, That the Faith he therein had published, with Regard to the Conception of Jesus Christ, was the Faith of the primitive Quakers.

Secondly, His Doctrine concerning Jesus Christ, and his Arguments to enforce it.

Thirdly, His Testimony against the Apostate Quaker.

To the first I produc'd divers Testimonies of our primitive Friends, which manifested their Belief of the miraculous Conception and Divinity of Jesus Christ

The P R E F A C E. 9

Christ, and fully cleared them from holding his Doctrine in that Respect.

To the Second, I produced undeniable Texts of Scripture to prove he was conceived by the Holy Ghost, and that he was THE SON OF GOD, THE ONLY BEGOTTEN OF THE FATHER.

To the Third, I made some just and necessary Remarks, and rescued the honest unhappy Sufferers in the South-Sea from his invidious Reflections.

But instead of keeping to the Laws of Reasoning, he hath diverted himself from the Matter, and hath opened a Field for a larger Debate than what could naturally have issued from the Premisses.

His Business, in the first Place, was, to invalidate (if he could) the Testimonies I brought of our primitive Friends.

Secondly, To prove that Jesus Christ was naturally begotten by Joseph.

Thirdly, To have made good his Allegations against those innocent Persons whom he calls Apostates.

But instead of performing any one of these Tasks, he hath left his own Doctrine unguarded, and ran away to the Trinitarian and Unitarian Controversy, which he had no manner of Business with, any otherwise than to shew what really his own Doctrine proves him to be, i. e. a Deist.

My Opponent very unjustly and disingenuously explodes my Examination, for that (he says) I go about to make a Plurality of Gods, and liken the infinite and indivisible Spirit unto corruptible Man; which I have not given any Room fairly to suppose, but fully guarded against it in Pages 43, 44, of my Book; but forasmuch as this Point

B

will

10 *The P R E F A C E.*

will come under my Consideration in its proper Place, I shall not detain the Reader with a Discussion thereof in this Preface.

As therefore it appears William Bromfield hath not attempted to invalidate any of the Testimonies I brought to prove what was the Faith of the primitive Quakers, he then hath tacitly acknowledged to the Truth of them; and so it will not be an unfair Conclusion, that he hath made a Concession to that Point.

The Matters then which come under my Notice, are,

First, To wipe off his Aspersions cast on me in divers Particulars.

And, Secondly, more amply to defend the miraculous Conception, and the Divinity of Jesus Christ.

I think it necessary to inform the Reader of the Reason of my undertaking an Answer to William Bromfield, and of the Nature and Consequence of his Doctrine; and that is, that although it may be Matter of Disdain to the learned and thinking Part of the World, yet it may do hurt to the inconsiderate and weaker Part thereof, who, without judiciously examining the Reason of their believing, are liable precipitantly to embrace such Doctrines, which may very much tend to the Hurt of the Christian Religion, and ought more especially to be opposed, when the Consequence of indulging these Principles must tend to their Subversion and falling away from the PURE CHRISTIAN FAITH.

That William Bromfield's Doctrine is such, I think, if the Scriptures be allowed to be the Criterion in this Case, cannot be denied; the which, if true,

The P R E F A C E. II

true, Mahomet's Doctrine is the next reasonablest System we may embrace.

For, according to this Man, we can have no Redeemer, no Mediator, no Intercessor, nor Reconciler to God, but poor lost Man is still miserable, and remains in the same State his first Parents by their Disobedience fell into; and so the World has been amused for about Seventeen Hundred Years, and all those Martyrs who died for the Faith and Testimony of Jesus, were all mistaken, and threw away their Lives without any Reason or Foundation.

I say, if his Doctrine be true, then all the aforesaid Consequences must inevitably follow; which I shall more amply shew in the following Sheets.

It is true, Mankind in this Age, very little concern themselves in religious Controversies, they being exercis'd more about abstruse and subtle Points in Philosophy and other Sciences.

But if we consider our selves as Christians we should be awakened by the Attacks of our Enemies, who so daringly strike at the Author and Foundation of our Faith; this is a Matter of the utmost Importance to us, namely, the Defence of Christ's Divinity and miraculous Conception; this is the Root, from which, and by which, grow and are nourished those comfortable Branches of our Belief, as Redemption, Sanctification, Justification, and that solid Hope of a merciful Mediator. As the Root is to the Branch, as the Foundation to the Building, as the Soul to the Body, so is this Doctrine to the Christian Faith; in short, it is the sine qua non, i. e. that without which, the Thing cannot be. As therefore the Christian Religion stands or falls by it, so there appears a greater Necessity of defending it than any other Christian Principle; for notwithstanding

standing they may and ought to be defended in their proper Places, yet this before all.

- And therefore I am a second Time encouraged, from Belief of my Duty, to maintain the miraculous Conception and Divinity of Jesus Christ, who laid down his most precious Life for the Expiation of the Sins of Mankind, and by that purchased Reconciliation to God for me and all Men, who lays hold of the Means offered to us in the Covenant of Life and Peace.

And forasmuch as I intend to answer all the material Objections of William Bromfield, advanced by him in Opposition to me, unless he shall produce better Arguments than hitherto he hath done, notwithstanding he should dip his Pen in Bitterness against me, I may not think him worth any further Notice of mine, it being likely he may have an Abounding of Leisure more than I, and also may find his Account in his Pocket; for that Reason he may continue scribbling till his Trash becomes a Drug, and lies on his Hands,

If my Opponent should expect my Credentials from the Meeting he directed me to, let him consider he wants the like; and so we are on an equal Foot in that Respect: Nor would I have him suppose the Brethren of that Meeting are of his Opinion, because they are not concerned in this Answer; for it will appear by a Minute of theirs, published at the latter End of this Book, that they deny his erroneous Doctrine, declaring likewise their firm Belief of the miraculous Conception and Divinity of Jesus Christ; but that their former Reasons swayed against their being concerned in the Dispute, judging it would not comport with the Dignity of that Meeting to interest themselves in the Controversy with so mean
an

The P R E F A C E.

13

an Author, and more especially since I had already engaged him on my own single Bottom.

I hope, Reader, thou wilt excuse the Prolixity of this Preface, which I shall, as much as possible, avoid in the succeeding Part of this Work, and desire thy impartial Perusal thereof, which I hope may be to the Satisfaction of those who have any Doubts or Scruples in their Minds, I writing not for Mastery, or to make my self popular, but to prevent the spreading of those Principles which are so much repugnant to Truth and the holy Scriptures.

May the God of Truth, by the Aboundings of his Grace through Jesus Christ his Son, our Lord, give thee a firm and stedfast Faith in him, ' In whom
' we have Redemption through his Blood, the For-
' giveness of Sins according to the Riches of his
' Grace.'



T H E

THIS Defence hath been writ near a Year since ; but was prevented being publish'd sooner by some intervening Accidents, which could not well be avoided : I hope, therefore, the Service of it may not be lost by the Length of Time ; but that the Truth of the Doctrine, and my Integrity in the Defence of it, may recommend it to the Reader's Favour.

H. B.

THE



T H E
 DIVINE and HUMAN
 NATURES

United in the PERSON of
JESUS CHRIST, &c.



AS in all Controversies it is expedient, there be a Criterion fix'd for determining the Points in question; and also the best and speediest Methods to come to an Issue, is rightly to state the Difference on each Side, and make short and regular Propositions, agreeable to the Nature of the Debate; and therefore the common Maxim takes Place, *viz.* A Question well stated, is half answered.

If then the first of these Maxims be allowed, whatsoever is fixed for the Criterion ought closely to be abided by, as having the sole Right of Determination.

I think there need not be a Question, what shall be the Criterion, my Opponent by his Quotations from, and Recourse to the Holy Scripture, hath unalterably bound himself by them; and also, as the Ground and Reason of the Controversy between us arises from thence, therefore I take it for granted they are the proper Determiners of our Debate.

I know it is a very fair Question in religious Controversies, Whether Scripture, Reason, or Authority shall be the Criterion; and which soever of them is fix'd upon, is closely to be adher'd to, and the others to have nothing to do in determining the Question: So that if Scripture be it, then Reason nor Authority of the Fathers have any Thing to do; or if Reason, then neither Scripture nor Authority of the Fathers, and so on.

This Point being so far settled, I set forward upon a Conclusion, That Scripture is mine and my Opponent's Criterion in this Debate.

The Controversy then between us is, Whether Jesus Christ, so often mentioned in the New Testament, was the natural Son of *Joseph*, or whether he was (as therein asserted) really THE SON OF GOD. *William Bromfield* hath taken upon him an Affirmative, to prove by Scripture he was the natural Son of *Joseph*, to which I maintain a Negation; and as he supposes he hath maintained his Assertion in his Reply, it comes properly under my Notice, to consider and shew how insufficient his Arguments are, and how unfair he hath been to brand me with curtailing his Book, and misrepresenting his Principles. I

I cannot well omit taking notice, in the first Place, that notwithstanding *William Bromfield* charges me with *false Suggestions* upon (what he calls) his *honest Intentions*, yet he hath not brought any one Instance to confirm it, and therefore I deny it as a Slander; and also what he farther says, That he believes *he shall find me to be one of those who have sought his Destruction, from his coming home to this Day, and have animated the Mob and mad Justices to knock him on the Head.* If the judicious Reader will give himself the Trouble to retrospect his Preface, he will behold the Inconsistency of this Man; for if I am a hot-headed Boy now, as he there asserts me to be, can it be supposed that I was arrived at a Maturity of Age at his coming home? that I should so early appear an Enemy against him, seeing it is now, according to his own Account, sixteen Years since he came to *England*, which was in the Year * 1711, after twenty two Years Exile, as he calls it?

And therefore it appears, it was not possible I could have any Knowledge of him, so as to become his Enemy: Nor have I now any Enmity to his Person; his Principles are what I explode. But in this I must be content to bear my Share in his unjust Reproaches, as well as those lawful Magistrates, (whom he calls mad Justices,) for exercising their Authority against Rebels to their Country.

I come to the third Page of *William Bromfield's* Reply, where he says, Henton Brown in-
C sinuate,

* Bromfield's *True Christian*, Pag. 67.

sinuates, as craftily as he can, that William Bromfield has no Principles of the ancient Quakers or modern Apostates; and so by his abominable Consequences will not allow William Bromfield to be any Christian at all.

To which I reply, that the first Part of this is false: I did not say he had no Principles of the ancient or modern Quakers; the contrary I have plainly asserted in the 7th Page of my Preface, in these Words, 'I did not design when I put Pen to Paper to write a general Replication to his whole System, there being divers Articles which we do own and acknowledge, with respect to the particular Matters thereof.'

Now is this saying he holds no Principles of the Quakers? If this is not a Falsehood, I can never pretend to judge of one: My Words are these; 'That he was not in that substantial Part of Faith, concerning the supreme Object of Worship, consistent with the primitive nor modern Quakers, and so by Consequence (in that Respect) none at all, and even take from him the Denomination of a Christian.' For he that denies that which denominates a Christian, denies his being one.

But *William Bromfield* denies that which must denominate him such;

Therefore he denies his being one.

The major Proposition is evident thus: He that denies the Means which constitutes a Thing, and that without which it cannot be, denies the Thing to be.

But

But *William Bromfield* denies the Means which constitutes a Christian, and that without which it cannot be :

Ergo —

And the Minor I prove thus: A Christian, in the strictest Sense of the Term, implies a Believer in, and Follower of Jesus Christ, and from whom, as he is Head and Leader, he takes his Denomination; and therefore he that denies him as a Leader, denies his being a Follower of him, and so consequently hath not a Right to his Denomination.

I suppose my Opponent will take Sanctuary under his own absurd Terms, that he denies not Jesus Christ the eternal Spirit, but the Prophet Jesus Christ to be the eternal Spirit.

To which I reply, if there was any Foundation in Scripture to make any such Distinction, or that it can be shewn there were two Jesus Christs, so distinguished as before mentioned, then there might be some Validity in his Expressions; but as the Scripture makes no such Distinction, nor can it be shewn they speak of any more than one Jesus Christ, so I think there can be no Refuge for him, if he should object in this Manner. The Distinction I have before observed, my Opponent makes in divers Parts of his Reply; which although he supposes are two infinitely distinct Beings, appropriates the same individual Terms to each; so that when he speaks of the one in the Capacity of a Prophet,

phet, he denominates him the same as he doth the eternal Spirit; and when he speaks of the other as the Eternal Spirit, he denominates him the same as he doth the Prophet; which is very absurd, to represent two distinct Relations by one appropriate Term: To maintain therefore his Opinion, that the Right of being a Christian, arises from the Denomination of the Eternal Spirit, he must shew how the Eternal Spirit came properly by those appropriate Names Jesus Christ, distinct from him who he calls a Prophet, and gives the same Names unto.

William Bromfield proceeds and says, *He hopes he may beg the Favour of his declared Enemy, that since he will not allow him to be a Christian, that he would declare and tell the World what he would have him to be, since he confesses Jesus Christ the Eternal Spirit to be in him, as he was in the Man Jesus, though not in that Degree.*

The which he might have answered, and told the World himself, what I would have him to be; for since I explode him for not being a Christian, it is plain I would have him to be one.

As for being his declared Enemy, I deny; I have not any Malice or Enmity in my Heart towards him, nor have I given any such Instances, but desire he may come to the Knowledge of the Truth, by believing in him whom God hath appointed to be the Reconciler of Mankind unto himself; and by our Obedience in that Faith which we have in him, do we truly and rightly take our Denomination from him; for as on the one

one hand, he cannot truly be said to be a Christian, *i. e.* a Disciple and Follower of Christ, who only hath a formal Belief, and doth not live in Obedience to his Laws; so on the other, no Man can be said to be a true Follower, unless he doth believe in him who is the Leader. The remaining Part of this Paragraph turns upon the Argument before; and as I have said enough to it, I shall proceed to the last Paragraph of this third Page, where at the Beginning of it, my Opponent asserts a downright Falsehood: He says, *Henton Brown takes upon him to be the Mouth and Oracle of the Quakers, and to expound all their Intentions, as well as if he had been in them.*

Now, impartial Reader, thou who hast read my Examination, judge whether this be true: Have I taken upon me to be the Mouth and Oracle of the Quakers? No; *William Bromfield* himself hath cleared me from it in the eighth Page of his Preface, in these Words: *He is (meaning Henton Brown) become an Apostate, if ever a Quaker; if never, then a notorious Hypocrite for taking a Profession upon him, and being a Scandal to those of that Profession, by publishing a Pamphlet contrary to the Judgment of a Meeting to whom he applied for their Approbation.*

Now if I publish'd my Pamphlet contrary to the Judgment of a Meeting to whom I applied, how could I be the Mouth and Oracle of the Quakers, who had denied to speak by me. For whatever I publish'd, I did it as my own Act, and not as their Mouth and Oracle: Nor have I taken upon me to expound any of their Intentions; for what Testimonies

I produc'd bore their own Weight, without any Exposition of mine. But from the Beginning, almost to the End of this Paragraph, is a Chain of Falsehood and Folly, not suitable to his Age, or the Seriousness of the Subject, which is only fit to be pass'd by in Silence.

He proceeds, Page 4. to Page 5. *I cannot find any solid Thing this Man is quarrelling about, but his Shadow or false Notions, setting up more Gods than one; but I fear his Malice, Idolatry, and Whiggish Principles, have made him mad.*

I reply, it may be he cannot find; but then it is either for Want of seeking, or a Capacity to seek: But it availeth not much to me what he says in that Respect, I regard the Judgment of the Reader more than I do his silly Animadversions. That I go about to assert a Plurality of Gods, is utterly untrue, for that I maintain the Doctrine of one only true and indivisible God, as all Christians hold; and this I hope to account for substantially in its proper Place, against his vain Attempts to shew the contrary.

But pray, Reader, behold the Reason of all these hard Names and ill Usage, he gives me, comes out last: The Man is angry because he thinks me to be a *Whig*, but suppose he should happen to be mistaken, will he not repent and reflect upon himself for using one of his own Clan so unhand somely? I confess it is something strange how he shou'd know what I am in that Respect, seeing (he says) he is a pure Stranger to me and my Ways. But pray what has *Whigism* to do in this Debate?

bate? Did he think that would gain him any Point in the Dispute, by saying my *Whiggish* Principles had made me mad? And what if I was to say his *Tory* Principles makes him use me so unfairly, would it gain me any Point? though I suppose there are many who would believe it to be true. But as this is far from the Debate, so it was Weakness in him to expose his Folly so bare-fac'd; and were it not that I might expect the Return, as before quoted, of *animating the mad Justices to knock him on the Head*, (or call him to an Account,) I might proceed farther. But I consider the Debate is about the Christian Religion, and in Defence of the Author of it, and therefore I chuse to proceed to the Matter before me.

It would be tedious for me to take notice of every Paragraph successively, he having so many times asserted and said the same Things over again, that I shall endeavour to collect his Sense together, I allow what he says, Page 5. that the Name of God is understood the Power and Spirit of God, and which Spirit our Lord Jesus Christ told his Disciples he would pray the Father to send in his Name, *i. e.* his Power: My Opponent allows, that he who thus spake to his Disciples was the Man Jesus. Now this Name or Power in which this Comforter, the Holy Ghost, which was to be sent, was either the Power of God, or was not the Power of God; if it was, then the Solution is very evident, that as this Spirit was to be sent in the Name or Power of Jesus, so this Jesus who promised to pray the Father was the Power of God: But if it was
not,

not, then he deceived his Disciples by amusing them with Expectations of a sufficient Power to lead them into all Truth, when in Reality he had no Power to communicate that would be adequate to such Ends and Purposes, he being no more than a mere Creature; nor will it be to the Purpose to say he spoke this respecting the Eternal Spirit, by whose Influence he pronounced the before-mentioned Sentences, but would rather aggravate his Crime, to assume the Honour of another's Power, which he had no Right to claim; for he says, he would pray the Father to send the Spirit in his Name; he did not say in the Name of the Eternal Spirit, by which he was influenc'd, but speaks of it as arising from his own Ability; such a Procedure would have impeach'd the blessed Jesus of most horrid Prevarication, to say he would pray the Father to send the Spirit in his Name, and yet mean it of another. But it appears that this Promise was fulfilled by the Appearance of the Holy Spirit, who did come in the Name or Power of that Jesus who promised so to pray the Father; for which Reason it was called the Spiritual Appearance of Jesus Christ, because he came in the Name or Power of the same Jesus Christ who so promised to pray the Father. My Opponent endeavours to back his Assertions with pleading, that to hold Jesus Christ to be God, *is rare Sort of Stuff for the Carnal Papists, Episcopal, Presbyterians, Independants, and Anabaptists, who see no farther than the fleshly Appearance of Jesus Christ.*

Which

Which in my Opinion argues the Weakness of his Understanding: What have I to do with how far they see? It is such Food as the Scriptures hath handed to us, and such as every Christian ought to receive: For I know no Reason, that because they rest in the formal Confession to the outward Appearance of Jesus Christ, that we must deny and disbelieve it for that Reason. But even these Expressions of *the fleshly Appearance of Jesus Christ*, he will not abide by, as will appear hereafter; and as it will come more under my Notice in another Place, I shall dismiss it at present, and proceed to the sixth Page, where *William Bromfield* says, I bring another Sentence of *Isaac Pennington's*; for I had brought some before which he did not object any thing unto, nor indeed to this. But what Militates against himself, he says, *I leave out the foregoing and following Words, which would more fully explain his Meaning*: But with *William Bromfield's* Leave, *Isaac Pennington's* Meaning wanted no Explanation, his Doctrine being delivered in intelligent Terms; and if those Words I omitted would have explained his Meaning to my Opponent's Advantage, how comes it to pass he did not produce the foregoing and following Words, and let us see what Meaning he would put on them; But it is enough, says he, *that he owns that the Word of God, the only-begotten of the Father, did take up a Body of the Flesh of the Virgin Mary, who was of the Seed of David, according to the Scriptures.*

I am indeed of his Opinion: It is sufficient what *Isaac Pennington* has said to over-

D

throw

throw *William Bromfield's* asserting *Joseph's* being the real Father of *Jesus* to be the primitive Quakers Faith ; and also, upon his own Confession, turns his Opinion upside down : And now, Reader, I beg thy Attention to his Confession, and judge whether the Man has got a regular Way of Thinking, or whether he knows what he believes himself : *William Bromfield owns that Part, that the Word which is God, and is the Only-begotten of his Bosom, did enter and take up a Body, born of the Virgin Mary, called Jesus, at about thirty Years of Age, but of the Seed of David, according to the Scriptures.*

Now hath not he here made as full and ample a Confession as any Christian would desire, and we might shut up the Controversy, but that a little while after he destroys it again ; for here he denies *Joseph's* being the real Father of *Jesus*, by acknowledging, *that the Word of God (which is God) himself did enter and take up a Body born of the Virgin Mary.*

Now I suppose he will not be so dogmatical, as to assert, that if *Joseph* begat *Jesus*, *Mary* remained a Virgin afterwards ; and I always thought there must be a Conception before a Birth ; and therefore if she conceived by *Joseph*, she ceased to be a Virgin ; but the Scripture says, and *Isaac Pennington* confirms it, and *William Bromfield* acknowledges to it, that the Body which the Word of God took up, was born of a Virgin ; and I never knew, heard, or read that ever a Woman was called a Virgin who brought forth

forth a Child, BUT SHE WHO BY THE SPECIAL AND MIRACULOUS POWER OF THE ALMIGHTY, BROUGHT FORTH THAT HOLY BODY WHICH SHE CONCEIVED BY THE OVERSHADOWING OF THE HOLY GHOST.

William Bromfield proceeds, and begs Leave to query, whether this Word was not the Holy Spirit of the Father, which came out of his Bosom by which the Worlds were created? and whether it was not this Spirit that followed the Children of Israel in the Wilderness forty Years; and was not the Rock and spiritual Bread that nourished them? and whether this Spirit was not called Jesus Christ?

To which I answer, that the Word which was in the Beginning with God, and was God, by him were all Things made that were made, and without him was not any Thing made that was made: This Word was made (or took) Flesh, as the * Apostle John asserteth, and dwelt among Men, and we beheld his Glory, says he, the Glory as of the Only-begotten of the Father, full of Grace and full of Truth; I say this Word was the Spirit of the Father: This Spirit followed the Children of Israel, and was the Rock and spiritual Bread which nourished them. All this I allow; but that this Spirit was called Jesus Christ, till united to that Body which was born of the Virgin, I deny; it was in that Appearance he was denominated Jesus Christ, and the Reason for it is assigned by the Angel, who appeared to Joseph, † 'Thou shalt call his Name Jesus, for he shall save his People from their Sins.'

* Joh. i. 14,

† Matt. i. 21.

Page 7. *William Bromfield* replies to the Testimonies I produced, to shew what was the Faith of the primitive Quakers respecting Jesus Christ, *That neither George Fox, G. Whitehead, Robert Barclay, Burrows, Howgill, Dewsberry, Ellwood, Fisher, Pennington, nor any others of the ancient Quakers, ever taught any other Doctrine than Jesus Christ in his Spiritual Appearance.* But I hope the Reader will be more impartial than to take his *ipse dixit* in Bar to my Proofs: I have (by their Testimonies) sufficiently shewn, they taught the Doctrine of believing in that Jesus Christ ' who died without the Gates of ' *Jerusalem*; that there is no Salvation in ' any other Name under Heaven; that he is ' the Mediator between God and Man; that he ' gave himself a Ransom for all Men; was ' accepted as an Offering and a Sacrifice to ' God, for a sweet-smelling Savour; that he ' made Peace through the Blood of his Cross, ' that he might reconcile us unto himself; ' that he was the Only-begotten of the Father, ' full of Grace, and full of Truth; and, in ' fine, that he died for Sin, that we might ' die to Sin, and by his Power and Spirit be ' raised up to Newness of Life here, and to ' Glory hereafter.' Now, as all these Doctrines are left upon Record in their several Writings, and than which nothing can be more evident, is it not very daring for my Opponent to say they taught no other Doctrine than what he has before observed? That because they directed the People to the Grace of God which came by Jesus Christ, as that by which they must know

know a Working out their Salvation, is it just for him to suppose they taught not the Doctrine of believing in him by whom this Grace came? This would be denying that the Grace of God is come, by denying, or at least not acknowledging him by whom it came; for 'as the Law came by *Moses*, so Grace and Truth came by Jesus Christ.'

As to his eighth and ninth Pages, there being scarce any Thing worth observing, I pass them by, and come to the tenth; William Bromfield, *replies this Adversary, runs on Jehu-like, he judges and condemns without ever asserting wherein William Bromfield is guilty.*

But it will appear to be a manifest Falshood, for I have not only asserted he is guilty of imposing a Faith upon the People called Quakers, but he hath acknowledged it in the first Page of his Reply, in these Words: *He (meaning Henton Brown) charges me with Deceit, and endeavouring to impose a Faith upon the Quakers.*

Now if charging a Man with being guilty of a Thing, and asserting a Man is guilty of a Thing, be synonymous in the Sense and Intention of Words, then will it appear whether *William Bromfield* hath spoke Truth, or not.

And yet further, I have not only asserted he is guilty, but have proved him so, by no less than ten credible Evidences, whose Testimonies he dares not call in question, but runs on, and says, that my asserting I had sufficiently shewn what was and is the Faith and Doctrine of the Quakers, *is a false Assertion;*
for

for here (says he) are no *Articles of Faith* laid down, by which any Man can understand, but only the *Opinions of divers Friends*, which *William Bromfield* owns, being taken in the Sense that was intended.

But if *William Bromfield's* Assertion be true, then mine is false; for *Isaac Pennington* hath divided his Doctrine into Articles, which he published for the Society, as their Principles; two of which Articles I produc'd, first and second; so that unless two Articles are no Articles, *William Bromfield's* Assertion can't be true: Moreover, the rest of the Testimonies I produc'd were quoted from those Books, which were approved by the Body of Friends, and therefore were not the Opinions of private Persons only: But suppose they were only the Opinions of divers Friends, I imagine *William Bromfield* will not disallow them to be primitive Quakers, and of the most eminent Sort, and must be allowed to know and understand the Principles of the Society; and therefore it is unfair to suppose they would publish any Principles as their private Opinions, which were not consistent with those of that Society they held Communion with.

But as this is like all the rest, the Reader may easily make a fair Deduction, without any further Observation of mine; only I will add this, that 'tis strange, (if I took Part of a Paragraph which made for my Turn, and left out the other which makes against me,) that *William Bromfield* did not take an Advantage upon me there, by producing that
other

other Part I did leave out, which (he says) makes against me, and expose me for so doing: This would have stamp'd a better Lustre on his Undertaking than calling me so many hard Names. But the Truth is, as I conceive, he saw these Arguments so irresistibly convincing, that he could not evade the Force of them, and therefore turns upon me with an unmanly Slander.

Having proceeded thus far, I come now to the eleventh Page of his Reply; where he exhibits another false Charge against me; certainly this aged Gentleman's (as he calls himself) Memory is very bad; for if he considers me a hot-heated Boy in his Preface, this is not the Way to make me cooler, and did not I experience at this Time the Reverse of his Opinion, I might be led on to use him suitable to his Demerit, but I consider his Age. He says, *his Adversary* (meaning me) *is not fair in this Quotation*, (that is, one in Page 10 to Page 11,) *more than the rest, for Part he puts in and Part he leaves out, adding Words not in his Book, and leaves them to the World uncorrected, and so blunders on, like him I guess to be the Author or Partizan in the Matter.*

I have just Reason to call this Man to an Account for his Unfairness, he charges me with leaving out and adding Words not in his Book, but has not brought any one Word to prove it: Was it not his Business to shew what I had added which was not in his Book, and what I had left out? I defy him to shew one Word I have added more than (*he adds,*)
what

what I have put in a different Character, which is a Demonstration of being designed for my own, nor can they in the Nature of them alter his Sense, in any Respect; it is not fair in an Author to make Complaint for his Opponent leaving out or putting in any Words, unless that thereby his Intentions are abridged or altered; but in this Case I have not omitted one Word which would render his Intentions more or less intelligible, nor added any more Words than as before asserted, for Proof of which, I will transcribe that Paragraph as it stands in his Preface, and as I have quoted it in my Examination; and judge, Reader, whether I am used in such a Manner as is suitable to use a *hot-headed Boy*, by a Man, whose grey Hairs might teach him to set a better Example.

‘ The Genealogy of Christ Jesus from *David* to *Joseph*, which the Evangelists took so much Pains to search out, to prove him to be the Messiah, and which all the Prophets agreed he should be the Son of *David*, according to the Flesh, which could not be unless the Son of *Joseph*; this must by no Means be allowed, because it will not answer their Purpose, and therefore they will have him to be the Son of *David*, according to his Mother, although they can prove nothing of her Genealogy, but it must be so, because they will have it so, which only answerstheir blind Purposes; but it’s evident the Evangelists and Apostles were of my Opinion, when they left us the Genealogy
‘ of

‘ of Jesus from *David* to *Joseph*, whom they
 ‘ believed to be his Father, who was called
 ‘ the Christ, as also did *Paul*, and the rest of
 ‘ the Apostles; and why we should not be-
 ‘ lieve as they did, I can see no Reason.

This is an exact Transcription from his
 own Preface, and the following is what I quo-
 ted from it.

‘ The Genealogy of Christ Jesus, from *Da-*
 ‘ *vid* to *Joseph*, which the Evangelists took so
 ‘ much Pains to search out, to prove him to
 ‘ be the Messiah, and which all the Prophets
 ‘ agreed he should be the Son of *David* ac-
 ‘ cording to the flesh; which could not be,
 ‘ unless the Son of *Joseph*: This must by no
 ‘ means be allowed, because it will not an-
 ‘ swer their Purpose; and therefore they will
 ‘ have him to be the Son of *David* according
 ‘ to his Mother, although they can prove no-
 ‘ thing of her Genealogy. (He adds,) But it
 ‘ is evident that the Evangelists and Apo-
 ‘ stles were of my Opinion, when they left
 ‘ us the Genealogy of Jesus, from *David* to
 ‘ *Joseph*, whom they believed to be his Fa-
 ‘ ther, who was called the Christ; as also
 ‘ did *Paul* and the rest of the Apostles.

Thus have I faithfully transcribed what
 is in his Preface, and what I quoted from it;
 by which the Reader may perceive whether
William Bromfield has done me Justice, or no;
 for I have not left out any Thing which is
 material to the Point, nor added any other
 E Words

Words than (he adds;) as I have before observed.

As to what he further says, that I *blunder on like him* he guesses to be the Author or Partizan in the Matter: If he guesses who that blundering Partizan is, he hath a better Guess than I; and I think I have as much or more reason to guess than he. But rather than the Doctor should suppose he hath got another Wig Enemy in Partnership with me, and so entertain Prejudice against him he guesses on that Account, I will freely clear him from being any Author or Partizan in the Matter: I here assert that no Person, directly or indirectly, had any thing to do in my Examination as a Dictator, or Director, or that knew very little of it till it was compleated. So that my Opponent is quite out in guessing this Time; and I advise him to have a better Foundation the next time he goes to Guess-work.

However, he says, *be it as it stands, it stands upon William Bromfield to prove by Scripture, and sound Reason, every Sentence he hath asserted; and for the Genealogy, its sufficiently proved, Mat. i. to Verse 17. and Luke 3. to Verse 23.*

Be it as it stands, because it can stand no otherwise, according to his own Writing, and I think he would not take upon him to prove more than there is an Obligation upon him to do, if it did not stand as it ought in his Opinion; if William Bromfield was as good at proving as he is at asserting, we might now expect something from him. But be that as it stands, we will examine his Proofs, and see how far they will hold good.

Those

Those Texts brought, *Mat. i.* and *Luke ii.* doth only prove *Joseph's* Genealogy from *David*, and serve as a Confirmation, that *Mary* was of the same Tribe, or, as *Joseph* being a just Man, would not have married her, being contrary to the Law, *Num. xxxvi. 6, 7, 8, 9.* as is the Opinion of Archbishop *Tillotson*. * Some Passages in his Writings being pertinent to this point, I have here transcribed them, *viz.*

He was of the Tribe, and of the Seed of *David*, as it was foretold the Messiah should be; therefore he is called in the Gospel the Son of *David*: And the Apostle to the *Hebrews*, Chap. vii. 14. appeals to the *Jews* concerning this, as a Thing clear and acknowledged among them, *It is evident that our Lord sprang out of Judah*; which he would not have affirmed to the *Jews* without Proof, if it had not been granted by them.

For the other, that he was of the Seed of *David*, the *Jews* will by no means admit, as a Thing at all evident from the History of the Gospel concerning him: For, say they, if that appear any where, we should find it in his Genealogy; but there we find no such Matter. There indeed we have the Genealogy of *Joseph* very differently related by the two Evangelists, *Matthew* and *Luke*. But what is this to the Genealogy of Christ, when the Christians themselves avowedly declare

E 2

that

* Archbishop *Tillotson's* Second Volume, Sermon 181. Fol. 531, 132.

that *Joseph* was not his Father? 'Tis granted that *Joseph* was of *David's* Line; but to prove that Christ was really descended from *David*, instead of the Genealogy of *Joseph*, they should have shewn *Mary's*.

This is a very malicious and spiteful objection, and the *Jews* insist very much upon it; but yet I think it is capable of a very satisfactory Answer. In which I shall proceed by these Steps;

First, We will grant that both the Genealogies of our Saviour, that in *Matthew*, and that in *Luke*, are intended to shew that *Joseph* was of *Abraham's* and *David's* Line; and that neither of them have the Genealogy of *Mary*: Some indeed have thought so, but it seems to me with very little Probability. I incline much rather to *Grotius's* excellent Conjecture about it, That *Matthew's* Genealogy gives us an Account of the Succession of the Royal Family down as low as *Joseph*, and that in *St. Luke* the direct Series of *Joseph's* Ancestors.

Secondly, The *Jews* grant that it hath been an antient Tradition among Christians, that *Joseph* and *Mary* were of the same Family; and that *Mary* was one that had no Brethren, and Heiress or Co-heiress, and so, according to the *Jewish* Custom, she was bound to marry in her Family, which the *Jews* were especially careful of in the Family of *David*, to preserve the Succession of the Royal Line, of which the Messiah was to come.

Thirdly, The *Jews* have nothing to object against this which shews it improbable.

Fourthly,

Fourthly, If so that they were of the same Family, then the Genealogy of *Joseph*, tho' not directly and expressly, yet by consequence was the Genealogy of *Mary*; and consequently those Genealogies in the Gospel do sufficiently shew that Christ was the Son of *David*.

Fifthly, It cannot be imagined that the Evangelists should have omitted the Genealogy of *Mary*, if it had not been included in that of *Joseph*; especially *St. Matthew*, who in his Genealogy expressly tells us, that he intended to shew that he was the Son of *David*, and also denies *Joseph* to have been his real Father.

Sixthly, If there had been any Question whether *Mary* was of the Line of *David*, the *Jews* would certainly in that Time have rejected him from being the Messiah upon that very Account, nothing being more plausible for them to have said than this; That he pretended to have no Father, and to be born of a Virgin who was not of the Line of *David*, how could he then be the Messiah, who was to be of the Seed of *David*? But that he was always own'd by the *Jews* to be of that Seed, appears by the Title so frequently given to him of the Son of *David*.

It was prophesied that the Messiah should be born in *Bethlehem* of *Judea*, *Mich. v. 2.* which you find accordingly fulfilled, *Mat. ii. 6.* the Providence of God so ordering it, that *Augustus* should then lay a general Tax; which Occasion brought up *Joseph* and *Mary* to *Bethlehem*, not only that she might be delivered there, but that there Names being then enter'd

enter'd, their Family might be ascertained, and there might no Doubt afterwards arise, but that they were of the Line of *David*.

Thus far *Archbishop Tillotson*.

But to return : These Texts being brought by *William Bromfield*, do not favour his Cause, for he cannot by them shew that *Joseph* was the real Father of *Jesus*, neither positively nor circumstantially.

And for the Virgin Mary's Genealogy, it is true (he says) *there is none ever yet found; therefore what cannot be proved, ought not to be allowed to an Enemy that takes all Advantages.* My Opponent doth acquit me here (though I suppose not designedly) from proving *Mary* to be of the House of *David* by her Genealogy, because, he says, there was none ever yet found; and I hope he will not be so unreasonable as to put me to prove a Thing by that which is not. The Reason for the Genealogy of *Mary* not being found, is because it was not usual to record the Genealogy of Women, as I observed in my Examination, (if it was, let my Opponent shew it,) their Husbands serving to denominate them of what Tribe they belonged to; and although there be not the same positive Proof for her Genealogy as for *Joseph*, shall it not be allow'd, seeing it is reasonable, when there is no positive Proof for or against a Thing, that the best circumstantial Proof ought to take place till it is invalidated? But the Quotation from *Bishop Tillotson*, as before, being sufficient to maintain my Assertion on this Head, I need not labour more to support it. Indeed *William Bromfield* doth not
in

in this deny she was of the Tribe of *Judah*, nor hath he answered what I offered, to prove it; and therefore I take it to be a Point out of the Question with us at present. I farther observe, that the Text he has brought, *John i. 45.* doth amount to no more than *Philip saith unto Nathaniel, We have found Jesus of Nazareth, the Son of Joseph;* and so he was nominally: But I deny that *Philip* asserted him to be the real Son of *Joseph*, which is plain by the succeeding Verses, and the Confession of *Nathaniel*, that *Philip* designed no such Thing, *John i. 48, 49. Jesus saith unto Nathaniel, before that Philip called thee, when thou wast under the Fig-tree, I saw thee. Nathaniel answered and said unto him, Rabbi, Thou art the Son of God, thou art the King of Israel.* Now is there not more reason to call *William Bromfield* to an Account for leaving out those succeeding Verses, which so fully explain the Matter, than there was for him to bespatter me so unjustly? *Nathaniel* attributes those Terms to that very Being which he saw, and with whom he communed: He did not say that Spirit within thee, and by which thou art influenced, is such distinctly from thy Person; but thou art the Son of God, thou art the King of *Israel*, including his whole complete Person which if not so, could not have been predicated of him in a proper Sense.

His next Proof is from *Matt. xiii. 55. Where the People of his own Country wondering whence Jesus should have his Knowledge; asking the Question one of another, and say, is not this the Carpenter's Son, for they knew his Parents? is not his*

his Mother called *Mary*, and his Brethren *James*, &c. I do admire at *William Bromfield* that he had no more Cunning than to produce the Evidence of those who were offended with him, for Proof that he was the real Son of *Joseph*: But at the most it is only a Query; Is not he the Carpenter's Son? for I allow he was reputed so; and therefore their Query did not arise from a certain Knowledge of his being the Carpenter's Son, but only as he was reputed so. And if such Evidence was to be allowed, I am fearful my Opponent would be stamp'd down for a most rigid *Jacobite*, if not a *Papist*; for if a Question was to be put to those who either know him personally, or by Information, Is not *William Bromfield* a *Jacobite* or a *Papist*? I doubt not it would be generally answered in the Affirmative. And would *William Bromfield* conclude this fair Reasoning? I believe not; nor am I willing to do the like, without some Overtacts which puts it out of dispute. And this is the same Case: He brings the Enemies of *Jesus*, those who were offended with him, to prove him the real Son of *Joseph*; and yet not a Proof, but a Query only, which he brings for a substantial Evidence.

He proceeds, and says, *That when the People heard Jesus say he was the Bread of Life which came down from Heaven, they said one to another, is not this Jesus the Son of Joseph, whose Father and Mother we know? How is it then that he saith I came down from Heaven? 'Not at all considering (says William Bromfield) that he spoke as a Prophet in the Name of the Lord, no more*

more than Henton Brown can believe that Matthew, Luke, and John, with Paul, were of my Sentiments.

I am indeed of their Opinion, that if Jesus had been the real Son of *Joseph*, how could he say he was the Bread of Life which came down from Heaven? It would be commanding their Belief to a Thing which was not, nor, in the Nature of it, could it be; and therefore I see as much Reason for their rejecting of him upon that Foundation, as I have to disbelieve that *Matthew, Luke, John and Paul*, were of *William Bromfield's* Sentiments. But pray Reader observe this Turn of our aged Disputant, *not considering he spoke, as a Prophet, in the Name of the Lord.*

Was there ever such a bare-fac'd Piece of Folly to support an argument? Could a Prophet dare to say he was the Bread of Life which came down from Heaven, by virtue of speaking in the Name of the Lord? Then so may every Person who is influenc'd by the Spirit of God, and speaks in his Name, say he is the Bread of Life which came down from Heaven; and to excuse his Blasphemy say he meant it of the Spirit by which he spake. Did ever any of the Prophets or Apostles say any such Thing? If not, what Title had Jesus Christ to say so more than they? No, they never presumed to say any such Matter; they never decked themselves with the Jewels of the Lord; but when they spake in his Name, they attributed distinctly all the Glory to him.

William Bromfield proceeds, and quotes *Acts* xiii. 23. and *Rom. i.* 3, 4. 'That Jesus was
F of

‘ of the Seed of *David*, according to the *Flesh*,
 ‘ and declared to be the Son of God, with
 ‘ Power according the Spirit of Holiness, by
 ‘ the Resurrection from the Dead.’

*He hopes there is none of the meanest Capacity,
 but must own that the Seed of David, which Paul
 speaks of, was in the Male ; for it is the Male
 that has the Seed, the Female is only the Earth
 prepared to receive the Seed.*

To these Texts I observe, that they militate against him, and not me ; for he is declared emphatically to be the Son of God, and that with Power. I always allow’d he was of the Seed of *David*, according to the *Flesh*, but these do not prove him so by *Joseph* ; and therefore cannot answer his Purpose, unless it was said, Jesus was of the Seed of *David*, according to the *Flesh*, by *Joseph* : But as it would manifestly have contradicted the other corresponding Testimonies of Holy Writ, it could not be so ; and therefore this maintains the Harmony.

With respect to what he says, that the Seed is in the Male, and not in the Female, it is his Assertion, I grant : But as it is an undetermined Point among the Learned, so there was a Necessity for him to have back’d his Assertion with suitable Evidences ; for I have found him so many times in the Wrong, that I am resolved not to trust him any more, without good Security : But, however, as the Scripture is our Criterion, I think I can plead an Exception to this Physical Notion ; it being early prophesied, after the Lapse of our first Parents, that the Seed of the Woman should

should bruise the Head of the Serpent : It doth not say the Seed of the Man, but of the Woman. I know he says, Page 31. to maintain this, I must prove the Woman had a Seed to generate, without the help of a Man. But with *William Bromfield's* Leave, that is not my Business; if I prove she had a Seed, my Point is gained : For it is as much absurd, to say, the Seed of the Man can generate without the Use of the Woman, as that the Woman can without the Man, physically. But the Text says expressly, the Woman had a Seed ; or it would have been Nonsense to say her Seed should bruise the Serpent's Head. The Question then strictly is, how this Seed came to generate without the Physical Means or Connexion of the Male ? But before I proceed to consider this Question, it may not be amiss to observe what the Apostle *Peter* takes notice of, as prophesied concerning Christ ; which may in some measure explain this Matter :

* *And David knew that God had sworn with an Oath unto him, that of the Fruit of his Loins he would raise Christ, concerning the Flesh.* † Now from hence it appears, that the Term *Seed*, is not particularly restricted to the Property proceeding from the Male, as my Opponent would insinuate, but is made use of in Scripture in a figurative Sense, to signify the Children or Off-spring of Mankind, as is evident by the preceding Quotation, of whose Loins *Mary* was, being of the Seed, Race, or Lineage of *David*, which are all

F 2

syno.

* *Acts* ii. 30. † Alluding to *Psalms* cxxxii. 2.

Descent

synonymous to the Fruit of his Loins. Besides, when we speak of the Seed of *Adam*, we do not strictly and particularly regard the Semen, but the Race and Decent of *Adam*, produced by the progressive Union of the Male and Female.

Hence it is evident, notwithstanding *William Bromfield* would restrict the Term *Seed*, to the Property of the Male only, yet it is plain, it is used definitively, to express the Race of Mankind, as being the Effect thereof; so that it is plain, Jesus was of the Seed of *David*, according to the Flesh, by *Mary*, who was of the Loins of *David*, the Off-spring of *David's* Seed.

I now reassume the Consideration of the Question before propounded, How the Seed of the Woman came to generate, without the Physical Means or Connexion of the Male?

That any Natural or Philosophical Reason can be given for it, I see not; and if there could, then would it cease to be Matter of Faith, and become Matter of Sense: But this I assert, that the Scriptures declare that *Mary* did conceive without the Assistance of *Joseph*. *Matt. i. 25.* for before *Joseph* knew her, she brought forth her First-born: For he, who has all Power in his Hands, could supply the Want of the Physical Operation of the Male, as well as he could dispose *Sarah* to be fruitful in an Age that was Physically past the Time of Child-bearing, although she wanted not the Operation of the Male; and yet had not the Power of God been concern'd in that Respect, she could not have conceived

conceived, the Course of Nature, with her being over: And cannot he, who hath the Power of giving Fruitfulness, when Nature could not do it, and that causeth Barrenness, when Nature is otherwise disposed; I say, cannot he, by the Over-shadowing of his own Power, give Conception to a Virgin, without the natural Assistance of a Man? Will *William Bromfield* deny this? and more especially, when it is confirmed by *Matthew* (agreeable to the Prophecy of the Prophets) before the Relation of *Joseph's* Dream or Vision? And there is as much Reason to deny every Thing asserted in Scripture, which is not the proper Object of Sense, as there is to deny this.

I shall dismiss this Point at present, until I shall find occasion to reassume it again in the succeeding Part, and cross to the 13th Page of *William Bromfield's* Reply; where I meet him in a full Carreer of Railery, but very inconsistently, and without any Foundation, but upon a Supposition, and an [*if*;] but his Supposition and his Guess are much alike. And I shall give it as a Specimen of his Railery, because I shall make use of it in Evidence against him hereafter, to prove him what the Reader may see he is. He says, *Such Knowledge as Apostacy could give Henton Brown, I suppose he has: He can talk, lye, and rattle, from his Cbildhood, (if I am not misinformed,) which must come from the Father of Lyes, the Devil, who is King, Prince, and Governor: For this Man doth not only endeavour to pervert the Scriptures, and the ancient Friends Testimonies, as well as mine, but he takes here and there a*
Sentence

Sentence that makes for his Idolatrous Purpose, and leaves out the foregoing and after Words, and will have his own Diabolical Sense contradict the original Contract between God and Man. As the first two Sentences, contain only general Charges, without Particulars assigned, it can hardly be expected I should plead to them : But in the Gross, I deny them, and dare him to produce his Informant to my Face, with any honest judicious Men, there to ascertain any Facts which would give him Reason, in Publick, to denominate me as he has done. Would any Man (who desires to be found a fair and impartial Author) be diverted from so grave a Subject, upon only a Supposition of his own, and an uncertain Dependence upon Information as his [*if*] implies, insinuate such Falshoods, upon so slender a Foundation? And which, if true, could not have been of any Advantage to his Cause, or Injury to me? For I know not who is accountable for the Miscarriages of his Youth, who by an unblameable Conversation for many Years, hath manifested his Difunity with them. And I am satisfied, if I had been ever so much guilty of that Practice, it is far more honourable to leave off Lying and Rattling at twenty one, than to continue it to seventy six; and whether *William Bromfield* is the Man, upon the sequel of this Defence, may appear to every impartial Reader.

I cannot imagine what Authority my Opponent thinks he hath in the World, that he can imagine his *Ipsæ Dixit* will be taken without Proof. How many times hath he charged

charged me with changing the Sense and Intentions of the Scripture, our ancient Friends, and also his own, with leaving Words out, and putting in others? But hath he brought any one Instance to confirm it? Here again he charges me with the same, although I have not added any Word to our antient Friend's Testimonies, nor changed any Intention of the Scriptures, or any Words of his. I therefore, to these Indictments, plead not guilty; nor have I any Business to give myself, and Reader, more Trouble than I need, to clear me from his Charges: I having done it sufficiently already, and believe, upon the whole, my Word will be taken in denying, as soon as his in asserting without Proof; seeing an Assertion, except in self-evident Propositions calls for Proof. It is as false as any Thing can be, to say, I will have my Sense contradict the original Contract between God and Man, (as he calls it, though it was not a Contract, but a Command :) Which was as *William Bromfield* quotes it, *Thou shalt have no Gods but me; and he that maketh or imagineth any other God in Heaven, or in Earth, or any Thing under the Earth, is an Idolater, and accursed.*

None but a partial Man (to say the least of it) would go about to misrepresent my Words in such a Manner. Did I ever go about to make more Gods than one, or imagine any other God, than the one true and living God? No; I hold and believe in one true and indivisible, eternal Essence, who created all Things, and by whom are all Things

Things ; to whom the Term God is appropriated and given, as the Governour and Ruler of the Universe ; who, in Page 44. of my Examination, I say, fills all Space ; who is not to be divided into Parts, nor circumscrib'd with Limits ; and because I go about Scripturally to maintain an intimate Union of the Divine and Human Natures of Jesus Christ, and by the Sacrifice of his holy Body, according to the Appointment of God, purchased Redemption for Man, he will have me to make a Plurality of Gods ; the which is as false as unfair.

In the first Place, I would query whether *William Bromfield* allows that Jesus Christ, who suffered without the Gates of *Jerusalem*, ? (For I must be very distinct what Jesus Christ I speak of because he will have two.)

Was, *First*, the Sacrifice God had appointed, to make Atonement to himself for Mankind ?

Secondly, Whether the shedding the Blood of that Body was universally efficacious to purge from Sin ?

Thirdly, Whether he was the Mediator between God and Man. ?

If he denies that Jesus Christ was either of these, and that his Blood was not universally efficacious to purge from sin, then he must deny the many Testimonies of Scripture which assert him to be such.

If he allows that he was, as before mentioned, then he must account for his being such, as he was mere Man ; the Absurdity of which I shall endeavour to discover. And,

First, A Sacrifice in the Nature of it, supposes an Atonement for an Offence committed ;
which,

which, when offer'd to satisfy Justice, must be adequate to the Nature of the Crime: The Offence was committed against an infinite God by our first Parents, and all their Posterity, they being potentially in them, and being of their Seed, partook of their fallen and deprav'd Nature, and was out of their Power to make Satisfaction to that offended God: Could Man then, simply as such, make this Satisfaction? No! For he was the Criminal, and stood condemn'd in the Presence of God; *for Judgment came upon all Men to Condemnation, Rom. v. 18. for that all have sinned, Rom. v. 12.*

If Man could not make this Satisfaction, then Jesus Christ, if he was mere Man, could not do it.

But Man could not make this Satisfaction.

Therefore, if Jesus Christ was mere Man, he could not do it.

Secondly, The Blood of Jesus Christ being universally efficacious to purge from Sin, carries in its Idea an Absurdity of his being mere Man, [which, as to the Nature of his Being, could not be; it supposes then, that he must be infinitely beyond all Men, considered conjunctly; or else, how could his Blood be so efficaciously diffused?

If the Blood of any Man could not be so universally extended to all Men, then if Jesus Christ was mere Man, his Blood could not be so extended.

But the first is true.

Therefore the last.

G

That

That the Blood of Jesus Christ was universally extended to all Men, I prove by these Scriptures, 1 John ii. 2, 3. *And he is the Propitiation for our Sins ; and not for ours only, but also for the Sins of the whole World,* Ephesians ii. 13. *But now in Christ Jesus, ye, who sometimes were afar off, are made nigh, by the Blood of Christ,* 1. Tim. ii. 6. *Who gave himself a Ransom for all, to be testified in due Time,* Colos. i. 14. *In whom we have Redemption through his Blood, even the Forgiveness of Sins.*

Thirdly, a Mediator supposes a Medium between two Extrems, and argues one greater in Affection and Favour with the Offended, than the Offender.

As Man therefore was the Offender, so if Jesus Christ was mere Man, he could not be the Mediator.

But the first is true.

Therefore the last.

That Jesus Christ is the Mediator between God and Man, is proved by 1 Tim. ii. 5. *For there is one God and one Mediator between God and Man, the Man Christ Jesus;* Hebrews ix. 15. *And for this Cause, he is the Mediator of the New Testament ; that by Means of Death, for the Redemption of the Transgressions that were under the first Testament, they which are called, might receive the Promise of eternal Inheritance.*

From all which it appears, that to assert Jesus Christ to be mere Man, these Consequences inevitably follow. And to establish William Bromfield's Doctrine, we must deny him in any of the Capacities before mentioned, or otherwise account for his being such,
as

as he was mere Man: The which cannot be done (to use *William Bromfield's* own Words) without *contradicting the Sense, and changing the Intention of the Scriptures.*

These Matters being premised, I proceed to Page 14. for I take no farther Notice of him here, as to his asserting I go about to comprehend in a mortal Body the Divinity of our Lord, it properly coming under my Notice in another Place, where he doth unfairly state, and unjustly explode the Christian Doctrine on that Account.

William Bromfield says, *It is not in this Man's Power to do Right or Justice to his Neighbour, for he leaves out the foregoing Words of this Sentence, as also the following, which would explain, in great Measure, this Sentence.*

But hold! whether is the Man running now? He is going to make me necessarily determined to do Injustice, by asserting I have not Power to do Right or Justice to my Neighbour: But then why doth he explode me for not doing what I have no Power to do?

But as I take this to be a forward Assertion, I shall not hold him to it; though in Justice he ought to be called upon to prove his Assertion: For supposing I had not done Right to him, (which I will not allow,) will it from thence follow I have no Power to do Right or Justice to another? But this is a Copy of the Original. However, the Assertion and Charge are much alike: I have observed already, that it is not fair in an Author to make Complaint against his Opponent, for leaving out, or putting in Words, unless that thereby his Intenti-

ons were abridged or altered : But in this it is manifest to the contrary ; for whereas I quote, *It is not by the Man Jesus that we are saved, but by Jesus Christ the Eternal Spirit* ; he adds, *who was with the Children of Israel in the Wilderness, &c.* as the Reader may see. So that the Object he speaks of I strictly regarded in the Quotation, but did not rehearse the progressive Acts of the Eternal Spirit, respecting *the Children of Israel, the Jews, and Prophets.*

The Matter then that comes before us in this Debate, is, Whether the Eternal Spirit (that is God) did only influence the Man Jesus? or whether he was essentially united to, and dwelt really and substantially in him? *William Bromfield* asserts that Jesus Christ was a mortal Man, extraordinarily influenced by the Spirit of God ; and that the Miracles he performed, were by virtue of that Influence which was of the same Kind which influenc'd the Prophets ; by which it must follow, the Actions he brought forth, were the Actions of a Man, partially consider'd, only influenced thereunto.

I say, that it was the proper Essence of God united to the Human Nature of Jesus Christ, and that the Actions he brought forth in that Body, as the Medium, were properly and intrinsically the Acts of God.

To shew the Absurdity of his Opinion, I observed, that it was not in the Power of one Man to offer up himself to God for the Salvation, much less to purchase Reconciliation for the whole World, as it is testified, in divers Places in Scripture, Jesus Christ did :

To

To which *William Bromfield* replies, *What does he mean (meaning Henton Brown) by Rail-ling, and foolish Suppositions, of one Man offering up himself a Sacrifice to God, for the Salvation of another? this is quite remote from the Matter in hand.*

Now I appeal to the Reader, whether this is fair Reasoning, for him to evade the Force of my Argument, by saying, it is *Railery, foolish Suppositions, and from the Matter in hand*: But if what he objects against of mine, be *Railery, William Bromfield* will come under a severe Imputation on that Account hereafter.

He says, the Question is, *Whether Jesus Christ, the Eternal Spirit, was not the Lamb slain from the Foundation of the World? whether he was not with the Children of Israel in the Wilderness; re-proved the old World for their Sins; was Crucified in Sodom and Egypt; was not in the Prophets in all Ages; and was the same which was in the Man Jesus, by which he spoke, and did all his Miracles?*

These *William Bromfield* supposes to be the Questions: But I think he is very much mistaken; for the Questions (between him and I) are, *Whether Jesus Christ was the real Son of Joseph, or really the Son of God; Conceived in the Womb of the Virgin Mary, by the overshadowing of the Holy Ghost? Whether the Eternal Word was influentially with, or essentially united to his Human Nature, and dwelt substantially in that Body? and how the Names Jesus Christ came to be appropriate to the Eternal Spirit, distinct from him who William Bromfield calls the Man Jesus?*

These

These I take to be the Questions: So that the Difference consists not only in Nomine, (as some have suggested,) but in the Quality of the Object.

And in the succeeding Sentences it will appear, (notwithstanding *William Bromfield* would suppose that my meaning is not easily accounted for,) that he absolutely contradicts himself, or else must allow he knows not what it is he believes: For here he puts a Question, *Whether it was not the same Spirit which follow'd the Children of Israel? and that the Man Jesus foretold his Disciples he would pray the Father to send in his Name?* Now I would willingly know whether he regards the Composition of Letters, which makes the Name Jesus, or whether he means, as is commonly understood (by Name,) the Authority or Power of Jesus; if he allows it in the former Sense, then it is plain the Eternal Spirit takes its Denomination from the Man Jesus; if the latter, then the Power of Jesus must be that of the Eternal Spirit, or another adequate to it. So that to take it in which Sense soever he will, there is an apparent Inconsistency in his own System.

But he proceeds, *If all these Things be true, (says he,) what can this blind Hypocrite mean, by allowing Jesus Christ to be called so by himself, but not by me? Let any Man that is in his right Senses judge whether the Man is not mad with Malice, and confused in his Understanding.* Now if any Man in his Senses can tell what my Opponent means in these Sentences, I am mistaken; for my Part, I cannot tell what he aims at, and

and therefore am not able to reply to it : But sure he forgot to mention one necessary Exception in his Appeal ; which is, Let any Man who is not a *Wig*, in his right Senses, judge ; for he having made Madness the Characteristick of *Whiggism*, that I wonder how he forgot to mention that Exception. He goes on and says, *I dispute, that the Man Jesus suffered as the Son of God, according to the Will of God, but not as God.*

It is true, I did say Jesus Christ suffered as the Son of God ; but deny that I said *according to the Will of God, and not as God.* And now hath not *William Bromfield* exposed himself for charging me with adding Words not in his Book, when here he hath added Words not in mine. Not that I plead this, for that it any way affects my Point, but only to shew his Unfairness, for falsely complaining of that he is really guilty of himself.

I need not labour to maintain my Assertion, that he suffered as the Son of God ; for the Apostle *Paul* is a substantial Evidence for me, *Rom. v. 10.* ‘ For if when we were ‘ Enemies, we were reconciled to God by the ‘ Death of his Son, much more being reconciled, we shall be saved by his Life. ’

From which Text it is evident, that Jesus Christ who was crucified, was the Son of God, and that by his Death, we were reconciled unto God ; and by the Life of the same Jesus we must know our being saved : So that the Observation of my Opponent hath no Validity in it ; and if he will not object against this Evidence

Evidence of the Apostle, in the Manner that he does, with regard to *Mary's Conception by the Holy Ghost*, (*viz.* reject it as rational,) I think it must centre in a Refutation of his unscriptural Principles.

Moreover, it is farther evident by a Text of Scripture which *William Bromfield* himself produced, *viz.* *Hebrews ix. 4.* *For how much more shall the Blood of Christ, who through the Eternal Spirit, offered himself without Spot to God, purge your Consciences from dead Works, to serve the living God.*

If then Jesus Christ was not the Son of God, but a mere Creature, and was only influenced to the Performance of his Duty, how could his Blood be so efficacious, as to *purge the Consciences of Men from dead Works, to serve the Living God?* This Text therefore militates strongly against *William Bromfield*, unless he can shew that the Blood of Jesus, suffering as a mere Man, could be so efficacious to the Purposes above mentioned; so that it proves that Jesus Christ suffered according to the Will of God; which Will or Word was united to him, and was a Part of his complex Person, according to which Will he suffered; not by the Will of Man, or his human Nature only, but according to the Will, Power, and Determination of the Divine Essence; and which disposed that Body as the Holy Organ to the determined Purposes of his own Will. It is plain then, I do not make the Man Jesus, simply as such, the Author of our Redemption, any other ways than as the Eternal Word was

was united to him ; and by virtue of which Union it is ascribed unto him.

Furthermore, it is evident from *Heb. xii. 2.* *Looking unto Jesus, the Author and Finisher of our Faith ; who for the Joys set before him, endured the Cross, and despising the Shame.* How then is Jesus the Author and Finisher of our Faith ? To consider him simply as Man, he could not ; for then his Power must have terminated according to the Nature of his Being ; and I deny that any Man, simply consider'd, can be the Author and Finisher of our Faith : He may, in some Respects, be said to be mediately the Author of our Search after Faith, and the Knowledge of God, but cannot be so, as in the Sense intended by the Apostle. It then is a false Suggestion of *William Bromfield* to say, *I will not allow God the Eternal Spirit, to have any Hand in our Redemption.* This is a manifest Perversion of my Intentions : For on the contrary, I argue, the Eternal Spirit to be the Foundation of our Redemption ; and the Human Nature which he assumed, and to which he united himself, described under the Denomination Jesus, to be the Medium of his Actions ; and as he was appointed for our Redemption, it was according to the Will and determinate Acting of the Eternal Essence with him, and which was the Offering that Body on the Cross ; the which (as being offered by the Eternal Word) was accepted as a sufficient Purchase for the Redemption of Mankind ; and which is emphatically set forth by the Apostle *Peter i. 18.* ' Forasmuch as ye know that ye were not re-
H
deemed

‘ deemed with corruptible Things, as Silver
 ‘ and Gold, from your vain Conversation, re-
 ‘ ceived by Tradition from your Fathers, Ver.
 ‘ 19. But with the precious Blood of Christ,
 ‘ as of a Lamb without Blemish and without
 ‘ Spot.’ See also *Hebrews ix. 14, 28.*

I shall dismiss this Point at present, and remark that the latter End of the before-quoted Paragraph contains some more of his abusive Rhetorick; and what it hath to do with the Argument, I leave to the Reader’s Judgment: *If this Man, says William Bromfield, knows no more of his Watch-making, than he does of God and his Christ, he must be a sad Bungler.*

But if I, who *William Bromfield* supposes a hot-headed Boy, was so hot-headed as to be diverted from the Subject, to retort upon him in the like manner, it might be feared we should quarrel about our Abilities in our Vocations, and turn our religious Dispute into a Mechanick one; which I think would be more unbecoming one who would be thought a cool-headed Detector, than a hot headed Boy: But if he makes the not knowing of God and Christ the Characteristick of a Bungler, I am of Opinion my Opponent will soon come under that Imputation.

I come now to Page 17. of his Reply, where he says, *It’s plain, the Man Jesus was him whom the Apostle Paul speaks of, that they had known according to the Flesh; and therefore he being gone, they knew him so no more; and his second Appearance being come, even the Eternal Spirit in their Hearts, they knew, and thereby became new Creatures.*

Now

Now Reader, I would query, whether thou canst understand any Distinction *William Bromfield* makes between Jesus, whom the Apostle knew according to the Flesh, and the Eternal Spirit being come in their Hearts? For first he says, *The Man Jesus was him who the Apostle speaks of, whom they had known according to the Flesh, &c. and his Second Appearance being come, even the Eternal Spirit in their Hearts.*

From which it is evident, that he here himself calls the same Jesus (whom the Apostle had known according to the Flesh) the Eternal Spirit, notwithstanding in other Places he blames me for calling him God and Man; for observe the Term [His] has immediate Relation to the same Being, and cannot admit of any other Construction; if then his second Appearance be the Eternal Spirit, his first Appearance must consequently be the same, only differently manifesting himself, the first by the Assumption of a human Body, the second influentially in the Hearts of his People. And upon the same Bottom my Argument before was founded; that of necessity had *William Bromfield* acted like a Candid Disputant, he must have acknowledged he had made use of the Terms improperly, or confess'd he was caught in his own Snare. His Words are these: *And for the Lord's Supper, which is called a Sacrament, I shew the Word to be of none Effect, it being never instituted by Christ or his Apostles by any such Name: But for the Passover which Christ eat with his Disciples, that ceased in his second Coming.*

Hence it is evident, That that Being which eat the Passover with [his] Disciples, *William Bromfield* calls [Christ ;] and that it ceased in the second Coming of the same Being, is altogether justly inferrable from his own Words; so that if the second Coming of Christ was the Eternal Spirit, the first must consequently be the same, and that was his appearing substantially in that Modification, who eat the Passover with [his] Disciples, as my Opponent very aptly confesses.

It would be vain for him to make a Distinction of the first Coming of the Eternal Spirit influentially in the Man Jesus; which cannot with any Propriety be asserted to be his first Coming, unless he will deny that he ever influenc'd any of the preceding Prophets and holy Men of God, and his following the Children of *Israel* in the Wilderness, and being the Spiritual Rock that followed them all; which *William Bromfield* has asserted, and I have acknowledged. So how he will account for his influencing the Man Jesus to be the first Coming of the Eternal Spirit, I cannot tell.

But that it was really his first Coming, according to my Doctrine, is very evident, because it was the first Time that ever the Eternal Word assumed the Nature of Man, and so appeared and conversed among mankind; which Eternal Spirit the Apostles knew according to Flesh, or by his fleshly Manifestation, they so knowing him, and the Ends and Purposes of such his Manifestation being compleated, they were no more to know him, so his Manifestation thereafter being Spiritual in their Hearts.

More-

Moreover, the Testimony of the Apostle *John*, is a cogent Argument to maintain this Doctrine. *John i. 14. And the Word was made (or took) Flesh, and dwelt among us, (and we beheld his Glory, the Glory as of the Only-begotten of the Father, full of Grace and Truth.*

How then is Jesus to be consider'd as the Only begotten of the Father? And how were those high Characters properly applied unto him?

First, He was the Only-begotten of the Father, and was properly so called, by virtue of the miraculous Conception of that holy Body which was begotten by the Almighty Power of God, and so was his Only-begotten Son in that respect, because he had none other which it pleased him so miraculously to produce. And,

Secondly, He was more immediately and gloriously so, by his uniting in Essence his own Eternal Word to him; and which appears plainly from *Hebrews i. 3. Who being the Brightness of his Glory, and the express Image of his Person (or Substance,) and upholding all Things by the Word of his Power, when [he] had by himself purged our Sins, sat down on the right Hand of the Majesty on high.*

Here then is ascribed the glorious Characters of infinite Majesty unto him the Son of God? And that it was the same who assumed our Nature is confirmed *by himself purging our Sins.*

These Characters then were applied unto Jesus Christ by virtue of this Holy and Divine Union, which gave him a Title to receive

ceive them, which could not otherwise be done, without the highest Imputation of Blasphemy. Page 18. *William Bromfield* says, *That by my nonsensical Consequences, I would pretend to prove he denies the first Coming of Christ.*

Which is nonsensical for him to suppose ; and if this is a true Copy of his Mind, I shall begin very much to suspect his Understanding, for he might easily see I aimed at the contrary ; which was, to shew, from his own Words, that he owned that *Christ who eat the Passover with his Disciple*, was the same *Christ, at whose second Coming it ceased* ; and from thence I draw'd a fair Consequence : If the latter was the Eternal Spirit, the former must be the same, according to the most just Construction of his own Words.

I come now to Page 19. where the Reader may perceive that *William Bromfield* doth fully declare that Jesus Christ was only a Man influenced by the Spirit of God : For quoting these Words of mine, Page 17. ' But ' that Jesus Christ was only a Substitute, ' and acted not of himself as the Son of God, ' but only influenced by the Eternal Spirit, ' is absolutely denied.' He adds for himself as his own Confession, *But the Man Jesus was so.*

From whence it is plain he denies that the Works performed by him were the proper Acts of the Eternal Spirit, but only as a Man influenced to perform them ; the which will hereafter be consider'd.

He goes, on and says, *He cannot omit taking notice still, in every Place, he makes false Quotations,*

ons, adds and diminishes what he pleases : Let the Reader look into the Original, and he will see *Henson Brown's Fraud*.

I should be glad the Readers would give themselves the Trouble to look into the Original, and see whether I have acted fraudulently by *William Bromfield* ; and then I am of Opinion, (if it is a Fraud to add Words which alter the Sense of any Sentence) that that Imputation will be fastened strongly upon himself.

In the first Place, he hath brought no Instance to prove his Assertion on me, nor indeed could he ; and in the next I will shew he hath added Words which absolutely alter the Sense of mine, and are not in my Book ; and likewise hath added Words in this Paragraph, which are not in his Book, or mine. What I quoted of *William Bromfield's* was the first Paragraph of the second Article, without any Abridgment, and stands thus : *And it was by this Spirit that Jesus spoke, and did all these excellent Things and Miracles in God's Name, and not of himself, as he confess'd.*

He hath quoted it thus : *And it was by this Spirit that the Man Jesus spoke, &c.* My Words he quoted, are these, ' That it was the Eternal Spirit that did perform these excellent Things and Miracles, will no doubt be granted : But that Jesus Christ (the Eternal Spirit) was only a Substitute, and acted not of himself as the Son of God, but only influenced by the Eternal Spirit, it is absolutely denied.' The Words which he hath added, which are not in my Book, are [the
Eternal

Eternal Spirit,] and which (if rightly quoted) at once supposes a foul Absurdity in me; for that it is irrational, to say that the Eternal Spirit can be a Substitute; for let him act by what Medium he will, he cannot act by any Power greater than his own; and to say he is a Substitute to himself, would be Nonsense. Besides, I said before that it was the Eternal Spirit that did perform these excellent Things and Miracles, and therefore would have been very weak in me to object the Eternal Spirit being a Substitute. But I believe the Truth is this, *William Bromfield*, by these Additions, thought a little to palliate his Crime, and therefore improperly and confusedly added Words to give him a Lift; but they rather aggravate his Guilt, than in any Measure extenuate it. However, my Opponent continues the same Man he was; for he hath not taken any notice of one Text of Scripture I brought to maintain my Assertion, but goes on, asserting many Things, and proving nothing; therefore I come now to consider those Texts of Scripture he hath brought for Proofs of his Assertions; and how far they answer the Purpose, will appear.

To prove Jesus to be the real Son of Joseph, he quotes *Matthew xii. 8. Behold my Servant whom I have chosen, my Beloved, in whom my Soul is well pleased; I will put my Spirit upon him; and he shall shew Judgment to the Gentiles.*

If this, says William Bromfield, was not spoke of the Man Jesus, called the Christ, deny if thou darest.

darest. It is now evident my Opponent is raising a Man of Straw, and fighting with it himself: I have no Reason to deny that this was spoken of that very Jesus who was born of *Mary*, and which this Text prophetically regarded, and what I have always allowed according to Scripture Doctrine, that the Word took Flesh, assumed our Nature, in which he did perform the Will of the Father; and in which respect he was a Servant, the chosen Vessel, the Beloved in which God the Father delighted, which is fully described by the Apostle, *Phil. ii. 6.* ‘ Who being in the form
 ‘ of God, thought it not Robbery to be equal
 ‘ with God. Ver. 7. But made himself of no
 ‘ Reputation, and took upon him the Form of
 ‘ a Servant, and was made in the Likeness of
 ‘ Men. Ver. 8. And being found in Fashion as
 ‘ a Man, he humbled himself, and became
 ‘ obedient unto Death, even the Death of the
 ‘ Cross. Ver. 9. Wherefore God also hath highly
 ‘ exalted him, and given him a Name which
 ‘ is above every Name. Ver. 10. That at the
 ‘ Name of Jesus every Knee should bow, of
 ‘ Things in Heaven, and Things in Earth,
 ‘ and Things under the Earth.’

From which Texts it is plain, in what Sense Jesus is to be consider’d as a Servant, and also my Assertion is thereby strongly maintained of the Divine Essence being united to his Human Nature: For he, who so took on him the Form of a Servant, and was made in the Likeness of Men, thought it not Robbery to equal himself with God. Now he must be equal with God, either in Essence or Power;

I

and

and it is impossible to be equal in Power, unless equal in Essence, and therefore must be God, who is equal with him. I would not have *William Bromfield* suppose that I make the Human Nature of Christ, abstractedly consider'd, to be equal with God; for that I plead in Exception to his Doctrine, because it cannot be predicated of any mere Creature, without being guilty of Blasphemy; and therefore the Foundation for such an Assertion, concerning Jesus Christ, must be the Union of the Divine and Human Natures.

I come now to *William Bromfield's* next Proof, *That Jesus Christ was no more than a mere Man*; which is *Matthew xii. 28.* ' But
' if I cast out Devils by the Spirit of God,
' then the Kingdom of God is come unto you.
And also from *John xii. 49.* ' For I have
' not spoken of myself, but the Father which
' sent me; he gave me a Commandment what
' I should say, and what I should speak.

To which I observe, that these Texts amounts to no more, than that it was the Power of God which cast out Devils: For whatsoever was performed by Jesus, was the Act of the Father; so that when he wrought Miracles, it was the Power of God by which they were wrought; and when he spoke, it was by the same; because the Essence of God was united to him, Jesus Christ was always very careful of attributing any of the Wonders he performed to his Human Nature only, which he well knew might have been construed Blasphemy by the Jews. : For that it was not in the Power of any mere Man
to

to perform these Acts, which nothing short of an infinite Power could do. He then, in these Expressions, could intend nothing else than attributing those wonderful Effects, to the Cause which was only able to produce them, and which was his Divine Nature, to whom only the Glory was to be ascribed; for he often represented himself as Man, and therefore as such he disclaimed the Attribution of the Glory for the Performance of those Wonders; so that these Texts, brought by *William Bromfield*, do not any way invalidate the Divinity of Christ Jesus, but only settles the Glory due to that Power, by which the Miracles were performed, and is an Argument of his Divinity, seeing the Apostle *Paul* asserts, *Colos. ii. 9.* 'That in him dwelleth all the Fulness of the Godhead bodily.' And again, *Colos. i. 19.* 'For it pleased the Father, that in him should all Fulness dwell.' And likewise what Christ asserted of himself, 'that he had all Power in Heaven and in Earth; that he had Life in himself; that he that had seen him, had seen the Father; that he was in the Father, and the Father in him; and that he and his Father were one.' All this he asserted of himself, which *William Bromfield* hath not taken any notice of, so as to answer; and therefore they remain as invincible Bulwarks against his Attempts.

The next Text he produces, is one absolutely against himself; which is *John xiv. 10, 24.*

'Believest thou not that I am in the Father, and the Father in me? The Words that I

and it is impossible to be equal in Power, unless equal in Essence, and therefore must be God, who is equal with him. I would not have *William Bromfield* suppose that I make the Human Nature of Christ, abstractedly consider'd, to be equal with God ; for that I plead in Exception to his Doctrine, because it cannot be predicated of any mere Creature, without being guilty of Blasphemy; and therefore the Foundation for such an Assertion, concerning Jesus Christ, must be the Union of the Divine and Human Natures.

I come now to *William Bromfield's* next Proof, *That Jesus Christ was no more than a mere Man* ; which is *Matthew xii. 28.* ' But ' if I cast out Devils by the Spirit of God, ' then the Kingdom of God is come unto you. And also from *John xii. 49.* ' For I have ' not spoken of myself, but the Father which ' sent me ; he gave me a Commandment what ' I should say, and what I should speak.

To which I observe, that these Texts amounts to no more, than that it was the Power of God which cast out Devils: For whatsoever was performed by Jesus, was the Act of the Father ; so that when he wrought Miracles, it was the Power of God by which they were wrought ; and when he spoke, it it was by the same ; because the Essence of God was united to him, Jesus Christ was always very careful of attributing any of the Wonders he performed to his Human Nature only, which he well knew might have been construed Blasphemy by the Jews. : For that it was not in the Power of any mere Man
to

to perform these Acts, which nothing short of an infinite Power could do. He then, in these Expressions, could intend nothing else than attributing those wonderful Effects, to the Cause which was only able to produce them, and which was his Divine Nature, to whom only the Glory was to be ascribed; for he often represented himself as Man, and therefore as such he disclaimed the Attribution of the Glory for the Performance of those Wonders; so that these Texts, brought by *William Bromfield*, do not any way invalidate the Divinity of Christ Jesus, but only settles the Glory due to that Power, by which the Miracles were performed, and is an Argument of his Divinity, seeing the Apostle *Paul* asserts, *Colos. ii. 9.* 'That in him dwelleth all the Fulness of the Godhead bodily.' And again, *Colos. i. 19.* 'For it pleased the Father, that in him should all Fulness dwell.' And likewise what Christ asserted of himself, 'that he had all Power in Heaven and in Earth; that he had Life in himself; that he that had seen him, had seen the Father; that he was in the Father, and the Father in him; and that he and his Father were one.' All this he asserted of himself, which *William Bromfield* hath not taken any notice of, so as to answer; and therefore they remain as invincible Bulwarks against his Attempts.

The next Text he produces, is one absolutely against himself; which is *John xiv. 10, 24.* 'Believest thou not that I am in the Father, and the Father in me? The Words that I
I 2 speak

‘ speak unto you, I speak not of my self ; but
 ‘ the Father that dwelleth in me, he doeth
 ‘ the Works, Ver. 24. Believe me, that I am in
 ‘ the Father, and the Father in me, or else
 ‘ believe me for the very Works sake. ’

And then he proceeds in his usual Dialect.
*Now, Hypocrite and Lyar, own or disown, if
 thou darest, these Scriptures : If they be true, Je-
 sus did nothing of himself, but that he was one
 with the Father in Spirit, and the Father in him
 by the same. William Bromfield never denied :
 If thou owns them, thou gives thy self the Lye ; and
 if thou disowns them, thou calls thy God Jesus a
 Lyar ; and therefore I advise thee as an Elder of
 Israel, and thou a young Upstart of Yesterday,
 in comparison of me, to repent and forsake thy
 Lyes and Blasphemies against the Holy Ghost, or
 God will avenge my Cause, who am oppressed by thy
 lying Tongue, false Assertions, Equivocations, and
 mental Reservations. There is not a Priest in
 Europe, in all the Tribes of Babylon, could
 have broach’d more Lyes and false Suggestions to
 drown Truth, than thou hast done.*

Now Reader, I query whether these are not
 railing Accusations, rather than Reasoning :
 If they are, then will *William Bromfield* ma-
 nifest himself, in Page 25. of his Reply ; and
 as I shall take notice of him, when I come
 to consider that Page, I shall wave it at pre-
 sent, and return to the Argument. I have al-
 ready observed, that the Words and Works
 which Jesus spake and did, were the imme-
 diate Acts of the divine Being, and as such
 they were the Words and Works of the Fa-
 ther, by whom they were immediately pro-
 duced

duced thro' the Son, and therefore he so particularly ascribed them to the Divine Nature, as the proper Foundation of their Being ; and which otherwise could not have answered the Ends and determinate Purposes of God. The Distinction then which is plainly intended in the foregoing Texts, is, to shew that they were the Works of God, and not of Man : But they do not infer that that Power was not essentially in Jesus : The contrary is evident, by his asserting he and the Father were one, *John* x. 30. although *William Bromfield* would lessen the Force of this Text, by pleading he was one with the Father in Spirit ; which is but a mean Subterfuge ; for in the foregoing Verses, he declares the Omnipotence of his Father ; and then in the succeeding Verse he says, *I and my Father are one* : So that it expressly infers, that their Unity consisted in Omnipotence, and not only in Will and Consent, as is commonly insinuated. Moreover, the foregoing Verses to which *William Bromfield* quoted, are very necessary to unfold the following, and which do fully revert this Argument, *John* xiv. 7. ' If ye ' had known me, ye should have known my ' Father also ; and from henceforth ye know ' him, and have seen him. Ver. 8. *Philip* saith ' unto him, Lord shew us the Father, and ' it sufficeth us. Ver. 9. Jesus saith unto him, ' have I been so long Time with you, and yet ' hast thou not known me, *Philip* ? He ' that hath seen me, hath seen the Father, and ' how sayest thou then, shew us the Father ?

But in Page 21. Paragraph second, my Opponent doth beat himself with his own Weapons

Weapons, as will appear. For its plain (says William Bromfield) he spoke in the Name of God, the Eternal Spirit, who had Life in himself; and he that saw, with a Spiritual Eye, the Spirit that was in Jesus, saw the Father, and that he and the Father were one, and all Power in Heaven and in Earth was in him, [that is, God.] This was no Blasphemy in the Son of God, the Eternal Spirit, which came out of the Bosom of the Father, to speak and declare; but if Jesus had not spoke by that Spirit, it would have been so.

Now, Reader, if thou wilt compare this Paragraph with the preceding in *William Bromfield's Reply*, thou may see what Confusion he makes in his Writing; one time he will have Jesus to be the real Son of Joseph, (and so a common and ordinary Creature;) another time he will have him to be one with God in Spirit. Now he fully and amply allows him to be the Son of God, the Eternal Spirit, by these Words, *It was no Blasphemy in the Son of God, the Eternal Spirit, who came out of the Bosom of the Father, to speak and declare, &c.*

Now it is a very fair Question to ask, who it is *William Bromfield* regards, that did so speak and declare these Words, (which I suppose he hath Reference to,) 'That he had Life in himself, that he and the Father were one; that all Power in Heaven and Earth was given to him?' I say, who spoke these Words? Was he, the very Jesus, who appeared amongst, and conversed with Mankind? Or was he not? If he was, then, according to *William Bromfield's Argument*, he was the Son of God, the Eternal Spirit, seeing, he says, *He*
was

was the Son of God, the Eternal Spirit, that did so speak and declare : If he denies that he was, then I demand him to shew his Authority for his Negation. But in the succeeding Sentence he confirms it himself, that he was the same Jesus, as before observed in these Words, *But if Jesus had not spoke by that Spirit, it would have been so, (that is Blasphemy.)* From whence, if he should infer that it was the Son of God, who spake through the Man Jesus, and made him the Organ of his Speech, why then he must allow that the Son of God, the Eternal Spirit, precisely understood, must be properly and essentially in that Body.

Moreover, if it was the Man Jesus (that spoke by virtue of being influenced by the Spirit of God, as he asserts,) he either spoke respecting himself, or another Being greater than himself. If he spoke of another Being, and that Being was God, it was Blasphemy in him, so to personate [God,] as to assume his Titles and Characters, and place himself in his stead ; for he says, *I am so, and so I have Life in my self ; all Power in Heaven and Earth is given unto me :* Whereas, on the contrary, he ought to have attributed all the Glory to God, as being altogether his Due, and not have taken any to himself. But it is very evident he did not make any such Distinctions, but asserted them as his own Properties. From all which, it is plain, *William Bromfield* hath destroyed his own Argument, by allowing it was the Eternal Spirit who did speak and declare, as is before recited, and which, he says, was Jesus Christ.

I proceed to Page 22. Paragraph second, where my Opponent begins, *Now, Blasphemer, consider what thou hast asserted, and see whether thou art not blaspheming against the Holy Ghost, in endeavouring to make the Eternal Spirit, which is the Holy Ghost, a mortal Man: Is it becoming one who pretends to be an Elder in Israel, so bare-fac'd and so daringly to assert a Thing, for which he hath no Foundation? Reader, I appeal to thy Judgment, whether I have in any Part of my Book, gone about to make the Holy Ghost a mortal Man. It is enough for me here utterly to deny it, because I shall take notice of it again hereafter, and so go on the next Paragraph.*

William Bromfield, in all his Book owns, that God was in Christ, reconciling the World unto himself. But in what manner this Acknowledgment is to be consider'd, he hath concealed here, though in other Places he explains it, which is, That God was influentially in him, as a Prophet who brought and taught the New Covenant, and laid down his Life for a Testimony thereof. This is the Purport of William Bromfield's Doctrine throughout his Book, namely, that Jesus Christ was the real Son of Joseph; that he was influenced by the Spirit of God; by virtue of which Influence, he calls him Christ; and this Acknowledgment of his, last quoted, That God was in Christ, reconciling the World unto himself. If the other Parts of his Book may be admitted Evidences against him, he intends and means, by God in Christ, only the Influence of his Spirit,

rit in the Man Jesus ; and whether the offering up the Life of such a Person would be effectual for the reconciling the World unto God, let the Christian Reader Judge.

Paragraph the Fourth, my Opponent says, *He never heard any honest and sensible Preacher, called a Quaker, ever say, that that Body which the Man Jesus carried, was God, until I find it now by an Apostate ; or that he suffered as a God ; which even the Babylonish Priests themselves disown that he suffered as God.*

But this is another Assertion of his, without the least Shade of Truth to support it ; nor hath, nor can he prove, that I said that Body which the Eternal Word took up, was God ; and which no ways can be inferred from my Words ; for I plead that Jesus Christ was God and Man, in two proper and distinct Natures, the one Divine, the other Human. Now did I say that the Manhood was the Godhead, or the Godhead was Manhood ? Or that they could properly be denominated so separately and disjunct from each other ; No ? And therefore I deny that ever I called the Body of the Man Jesus, God, in an abstracted Sense.

I did say he suffered as the Son of God, and doubt not, shall prove it substantially in its Place ; although I did not say the Divine Being, precisely understood, did or could suffer, it being not liable to Passion or Affection ; but that Jesus Christ suffered as the Son of God, I have already proved in Page 80. by *Romans v. 10. For if when we were Enemies, we were reconciled to God by the Death of his*
K
Son,

Son, much more being reconciled, we shall be saved by his Life. Divers more Texts of Scripture I might produce to strengthen this ; but it being so much to the Purpose, I need not detain the Reader.

And this I conceive is no ways repugnant to sound Reason, as may further appear, because he was the Son of God, really with regard to the Existence of his Human Nature ; for Mary conceived by the Over-shadowing of the Holy Ghost, though *William Bromfield* denies it, *Matt. i. 20.* And the Angel that appeared unto Joseph, saith unto him, fear not to take unto thee, Mary thy Wife ; for that which is conceived in her, is of the Holy Ghost : And *Luke i. 31, 32.* And behold thou shalt conceive in thy Womb, and bring forth a Son, and shalt call his Name Jesus : He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Highest ; and the Lord God shall give unto him the Throne of his Father David. It is then from hence, that this Jesus was the Son of God ; not only because the Eternal Word was united to him, but also by being conceived by the Over-shadowing of the Holy Ghost ; and so in that peculiar Respect he was the Son of God, [not a Son,] but the Son, being the Only and First-begotten of the Father. And this very Jesus (who was so begotten, and was the Son of the Highest) was crucified ; and therefore suffered as he was the Son of God, prepared by the Father for that Purpose, and brought to it by his own Will, which was the immediate Cause of all his Actings.

Having said enough to this Point, as fully to answer his Objections, I come now to consider

sider that Part of Page 24. which relates to myself; and although *William Bromfield* would not be supposed an envious Man, yet he gives me Reason^a here to appeal to the Impartial, what other Construction can be put on him: For in the Beginning of this Page, to render me as odious as he can in the Eyes of my Brethren, trumps up an old Circumstance of my marrying by the Priest; the which I shall bestow a little Time on, not only to shew how unfair and mistaken he is, but also to clear myself from the Imputation of his Reflections on that Account.

His Words are these, *But Henton Brown knows nothing of this Spiritual Work; for he having gone back again into Babylon (if he ever was out of it) by joining with their Doctrines, denying his Father and Mother's Marriage lawful, terming them thereby Rogue and Whore, and himself a Bastard, by going to those Priests for a Marriage for himself.*

Well, Reader, dost thou think these Expressions fit to come from one who would be counted an Elder in *Israel*? And dost thou believe they are railing Accusations, or not?

But suppose *William Bromfield* should be mistaken about my Father and Mother's Marriage, ought not he to submit, and allow himself in the Wrong? Which I am certain he is; for my Father and Mother being not of the People called Quakers, when they married, so consequently could not be married among them, but they were married by the *Babylonish* Priests, as *William Bromfield* calls them, and so was I; and then, pray, how have I denied their

Marriage lawful ? My Opponent and his Informant (if he had any) are quite out this Time. But supposing they had been married among the People, called Quakers, as their Marriages are accounted valid, how could I term them Rogue and Whore, and myself a Bastard ? For if I had acted on a Point of Judgment, and preferr'd the other Way before that, must it necessarily be supposed, that because I did not like the Marriages of the People, called Quakers, so well as the other, they must be unlawful, and my Father a Rogue, my Mother Whore, and my self a Bastard ? How could an aged Man have no more modesty, than to put such Billingsgate Stuff into a Book, which was wrote on a religious Controversy ? But I rather think he designed this for a general Reflexion, and took this Opportunity to vend his rebellious Wrath upon me.

But to prevent any wrong Imputation, I do in Publick, acknowledge, that when I married, although I was nominally a Quaker, yet not thoroughly convinced in my Understanding that Way, and therefore was Matter of Indifference to me where I married, and was not done in Point of Judgment, to deny the Marriages of the People called Quakers lawful, I having not given my self Time to consider any Thing about it, it being an early Age I joined myself in that Contract ; for which Act, although it was not an Act of Judgment, yet when I came to riper Years, and beheld the good Order and Discipline of my Brethren, whom I desired to hold Communi-
on

on with, knowing then that it was contrary to the Rule of the Society, I thought it necessary to acknowledge my Dislike, that I should make a Breach in the Rule of any Society I was inclined to join myself a Member to. And as my Friends, to whom properly I was accountable, accepted what I offer'd as a sufficient Expiation for the Commission of that Action, was it fair, and like a Disputant, to make use of it as an Argument against my writing an Answer to him. Thus have I truly unfolded this great Affair, in which he hath seem'd so much to triumph: But whether is it to his Honour, to treat one after this Manner, who writes in Defence of the Christian Doctrine, I leave the Reader to judge; nor should I have taken notice of those Reproaches, with regard to myself, were it not to shew what mean Subterfuges Men will make use of in the Defence of a bad Cause.

However, says William Bromfield, I will bring no railing Accusations against this Man, but shall say with the Angel to Satan, the Lord rebuke thee for thy wilful Ignorance, Blasphemy, and malicious Reflections, &c.

Now, Reader, dost thou believe *William Bromfield* speaks Truth? He says he will bring no railing Accusations against me. But I will give thee the Catalogue, and then judge: He says, 'I am one of the Champions of the Apostates, ' a hot-headed Boy, a Scandal to my Profession, ' the Champion of Antichrist; that I am mad; ' that I talk, lye, and rattle from my Childhood; I will have my own diabolical Sense; ' that

' that I am mad with Malice, a Thief, and a
 ' Robber; I have jesuitical Insinuations, and am
 ' an Hypocrite and Lyar; that there is never a
 ' Priest in *Europe* could broach more Lyes and
 ' false Suggestions than I have done; that I am a
 ' Blasphemer; that by going to the Priest, for a
 ' Marriage, I termed my Father and Mother
 ' Rogue and Whore, and myself a Bastard; that
 ' I am ignorant and impudent, &c.' and yet
 my Opponent said he would bring no railing
 Accusations against me: But, indeed, I think
 he has brought enough to prove he speaks un-
 truly; for if these be not railing Accusati-
 ons, pray what could he say more to amount
 to them, except he had called me Rogue and
 Villain, or such like? But lest he should ex-
 cuse himself, under the Term, *He will bring*
no railing Accusations, and which regards
 the future, I will here produce several other
 after he had made this Promise, and which
 will further manifest what he is, and even in
 the same Page 25. immediately succeeding
 his Promise, he says, ' The Lord rebuke thee
 ' for thy wilful Ignorance, Blasphemy, and
 ' malicious Reflections: ' Page 31. he says, ' I
 ' am out of my Senses, or never had any that
 ' were true.' Page 38. ' I am a noisy silly Fel-
 ' low.' Page 39. ' That I am an obstinate Apo-
 ' state and Hypocrite, a wild Man in Darknes.'
 Page 42. ' A Champion of Antichrist, an ig-
 ' norant Mechanick, an audacious Man.' Page
 47. ' That I am a bold lying Fellow, and
 ' makes no Scruple of calling Truth Falshood,
 ' and Falshood Truth.' But Reader I stop here,
 at Page 50. where in the Prosecution of my
 giving

giving a Catalogue of *William Bromfield's* railing Accusations, I find him here to confirm himself to be what thou mayest easily determine ; *I will not [says he] upbraid nor glory over this poor young Man.* But pray mind if he has not forgot himself ; *nor expose his foolish Suppositions, and false Assertions, with lying Accusations, &c.* And then proceeds, Page 51. *Vain Man, I conjure thee upon thy Life. Page. 55. an Apostate and Hypocrite ;* and with many more hard Names, which would be tedious to mention. This Catalogue which I have already given, being sufficient to convict him, I shall leave it to the Reader to pass Sentence on him according to his Demerit, and return to Page 25. from which I was occasionally diverted by the foregoing Circumstances ; where he quotes these Words from my Examination, Fol. 23. *That it may be, Moses might not have so clear a View ; he puts in, as the succeeding Prophets.* (Which I did not say ;) but leaves out these Words, or at least, *did not give his Prophecy so particular ;* and then I add, *that the succeeding Prophecies may be explanatory to that of Moses.* And which I shewed in divers Instances, the which he ridicules as a *lame Argument,* although he hath not essayed to manifest it to be such ; nor hath he considered any one Instance I brought for Confirmation of my Supposition, but endeavours to evade the Force of them, by asserting a Contradiction to Jesus Christ's own Words, as followeth : *For from Moses, till Jesus Christ came in the Flesh, none was so great as Moses.*

Whereas

Whereas Christ saith, *Matthew ix. 11. Verily I say unto you, among them that are born of Women, there hath not risen a greater than John the Baptist; notwithstanding, he that is least in the Kingdom of Heaven, is greater than he.*

From which it appears, that this Assertion of *William Bromfield's* is wrong, as well as many others before manifested; nor hath he consider'd any of the Prophecies I quoted, to shew they were explanatory to *Moses*, but only says, I brought them to fill up my Book, although they have such a singular regard to the very Person of *Jesus Christ*, and to whom they ascribe the Characters of Infinite Majesty.

William Bromfield says, also in this same Paragraph, that he don't find any of them (meaning the Prophets) but speak vastly different between the Man *Jesus*, called the Christ, who was testified of as a Servant, the Messenger of the New Covenant, and *Jesus Christ the Eternal Spirit*, that he was endued with. But he would have done well to have shewed the vast Difference the Prophets made between those Beings described by the same individual Names: For my Part, I cannot see any they make; for the Characters and Properties of God are appropriated to that very Being, the Man *Jesus* called the Christ, (as *William Bromfield* styles him,) without any Distinction from his Manhood. Nor could it be otherwise; for I shall hereafter shew that he was both God and Man, and so had the Characters and Properties of each Nature ascribed to him, by
virtue

virtue of those Natures, being united in one and the self same Person.

I proceed, and come to Page 26. where my Opponent doth give me an Advantage to state an Argument, which entirely overturns his System. He says, *It must be acknowledged there were divers in the Holy Scriptures that were called Saviours, as Joshua and others, yet there was none ever called the Universal Saviour but God himself, who declared he was the God of Israel and their Saviour.*

I grant readily, there were those in Scripture who were called Saviours; and also, that none ever was called the Universal Saviour but God himself, it being his incommunicable Property. Now if none was ever called the Universal Saviour, but God; then if Jesus Christ was called the Universal Saviour, he is God.

But Jesus Christ was called the Universal Saviour, therefore he is God.

The Hypothesis, upon which this Argument is founded, is justly inferrable from *William Bromfield's* own Confession, and the Propositions and Consequences following are evident. My Business then to prevent them from any Invasion, is to shew that that Incommunicable Property of God (the Universal Saviour) is applied unto Jesus Christ.

I take it, that the Word *Universal*, as here made use of, is to signify the Power and Extension of such Power of He, who is the Saviour, and made use of to shew the Difference between those who were called Saviours in some Common, Ordinary, and External Acts, and He, who was the Almighty

L

Savi.

Saviour, distinguish'd and dignify'd by that Power which was able to save from Sin, and called Universal, because it is the highest Capacity in which any Saviour can be consider'd. And such a one Jesus Christ is declared to be in these following Testimonies of Scripture, *Matthew i. 21. And she shall bring forth a Son, and thou shalt call his Name Jesus, for he shall save his People from their Sins. John iv. 42 And many more believed, because of his own Word, and said unto the Woman, Now we believe, not because of thy Saying, for we have heard him our selves, and know that this is indeed the Christ, the Saviour of the World. Acts xiii. 23. Of this Man's Seed hath God, according to his Promise, raised unto Israel a Saviour, Jesus. Ver. 28. Be it known unto you, Men and Brethren, that through him is preached unto you the Forgiveness of Sins. Ver. 39. And by him, all that believe are justified from all Things; from which ye could not be justified by the Law of Moses. John iv. 14. And we have seen, and do testify, that the Father sent the Son to be the Saviour of the World. Ver. 15. Whosoever shall confess that Jesus is the Son of God, God dwelleth in him, and he in God. Luke ii. 11. For unto you is born this Day, in the City of David, a Saviour, which is Christ the Lord, Luke ii. 10.*

From all which Testimones, and many more, which might be produced the highest Properties of a Saviour are applied to Jesus Christ, and than which there is no other. For none can save from Sin, but God: But Jesus Christ can save from Sin, therefore he is God.

Moreover, it appears further from *Isaiah xiv. 21, 22. Have I not the Lord? And there is*

no God else besides me. A just God and a Saviour, there is none besides me; look unto me all ye Ends of the Earth, and be ye saved. As it is plainly intended in these Expressions, that there was no Saviour but God, who could save from Sin, and who was the Saviour of the World, and to whom all the Ends of the Earth were to look for Salvation; so that he, in whom these Properties of a Saviour were to be found must consequently be God.

But the Properties of such a Saviour were found in Jesus Christ;

Therefore he is God.

Now as all these Deductions are fair from *William Bromfield's* own Words, so I hope the Reader will make the best use of them he can; and which, in my Opinion, will terminate the Dispute in the Probation of the Christian Doctrine. The next Words I produce of *William Bromfield's* are these; *And for David's saying, The Lord said unto my Lord, sit thou on my Right Hand, until I make thine Enemies thy Footstool; it is no more (says he) than was said in the Beginning, That God said, let us make Man; it's not therefore to be supposed that there was more Gods than one.*

As for the Analogy that this Text of Scripture bears to the Sentence of my Opponent, and what it has to do with this Argument, I leave to the Reader's Judgment; whereas I quoted it, to shew that the Divine Perfections of Infinite Majesty were ascribed to Jesus Christ, and fix'd the Properties of the Divine Nature in that Being; as appears fully from *Hebrews i. 6, 7, 8, 9.* And again, *when he bringeth in the First-begotten*
L 2
into

into the World, he saith, And let all the Angels of God worship him. Ver. 7. And of the Angels, he saith, Who maketh his Angels Spirits, and his Ministers a Flame of Fire. Ver. 8. But unto the Son he saith, Thy Throne, O God, is for ever and ever ; a Scepter of Righteousness is the Scepter of thy Kingdom. Ver. 9. Thou hast loved Righteousness, and hated Iniquity ; therefore God, even thy God, hath anointed thee with the Oil of Gladness above thy Fellows.

These Expressions have immediate Relation to Jesus Christ, as he was God, and as he was Man. *First*, it said unto the Son, *Thy Throne, O God, is for ever and ever* : Here he is declared to be equal to the Father ; for as the Father is God, so is the Son ; and as the Father's Throne is for ever and ever, so is the Son's.

And Secondly, To the same Jesus Christ, it is said, *God, even thy God, hath anointed thee with the Oil of Gladness above thy Fellows.* This hath immediate Reference to him as he was Man, and therefore it is evident that God and Man were united in that one Person, because the Characters of God and Man are distinctly given unto him. But if I were to turn, and ask what Constructions *William Bromfield* put on these Words of his, *Let us make Man*, as this was spoke in the plural Number, it supposes there was some proper Distinctions in the Godhead, which laid a Foundation for these Expressions, or that they infer a Communication to the Angels, in the Work of Creation ; which, I think, would be very absurd to suppose ; for then they

they would have been Joint-Creators with God ; and I judge it against Scripture and Reason, that Creatures should be Joint-Creators.

It was not reasonable they could have any hand in our Creation, it being done by the Almighty Word, or Will of God.

But even whilst my Opponent is unjustly quarrelling about making (as he says) a Plurality of Gods, and insinuating himself to be a Unitarian, yet he makes the very same Distinctions that I do, (contrary to the Scope of his Book,) for he calls [God] Father, Son, and Holy Ghost ; and what Foundation he has for these Distinctions, I must leave. What doth he mean by the Father, a distinct Term from the Son ; and the Son, a distinct Term from the Father ; and the Holy Ghost, distinct Terms from both ? Hath he a different Idea of the Father from the Son, and the Son from the Father, and the Holy Ghost from both ? Or how, and in what manner, are we to understand he considers these distinct Terms, seeing that every Term hath a proper Idea belonging to it ? I grant this is somewhat a Digression from the Point, but I made these Observations, because he seems to be so very dogmatical.

As I would not detain the Reader, longer than the Necessity of the Case requires, so I would not pass over any Thing which is material, and requires Consideration ; I therefore pass to Page 28. where I think it necessary to take notice of these Words, taking in the latter Part of Page 27. *That all these glorious,*

Glorious Sayings of the Prophets are properly applied unto God the Eternal Spirit, who was in Jesus, reconciling the World unto himself, and not unto the Man Jesus, who was a mortal Man ; for unless Henton Brown will have more Gods than one, I cannot see what else he would be at ; I would have him to be plain, and own above board, that he will have the Man Jesus to be the true God ; and that there never was any other ; or allow a Plurality of Gods ; or own the Truth, that God Almighty was in the Prophet Jesus, reconciling the World unto himself. Now one of these Three must be allowed ; but which he will pitch upon, I cannot tell.

In the first Place, it is to be noted, that *William Bromfield* declares without any Hesitation, that *Jesus Christ* was a mortal Man : And I shall endeavour to answer these Questions concise as I can ; for that I shall have Occasion, more fully to discuss the particular Matters contained in these Propositions hereafter. To the first, then I acknowledge, that if he means, (as indeed he has declared,) by the Man Jesus a simple Human Being, I do deny that he could be God ; or, only as a Prophet, he could, without being guilty of Blasphemy, have the Characters and Properties of God ascribed unto him by virtue of any Influence, although ever so great. Secondly, I utterly deny a Plurality of Gods, or that I ever pleaded for any such Thing ; for that I hold and believe in one only Wise, Eternal, and Indivisible God, as I have before expressed. And Thirdly, I acknowledge, according to Scripture, that God was in Christ, reconciling

reconciling the World unto himself. But *William Bromfield* hath not stated his Proposition, according to the Text ; for he says, I must acknowledge, *as the Truth, that God was in the Prophet Jesus, reconciling the World unto himself.*

Now he, who makes use of any Text of Scripture to state a Question, to which is expected an Answer, ought to state it exactly agreeable to the Text. The Text says, *God was in Christ, reconciling the World unto himself.* The Word Christ is commonly understood, to regard the Son of God in his Divine Nature ; and therefore [God] the Father, in Christ his Son, was reconciling the World unto himself. This is what I believe was truly intended by the Apostle ; and this I fully and sincerely own : But that God was only influentially, (as in other Prophets,) *in the Prophet Jesus, reconciling the World unto himself,* as it is Unscriptural, I reject it as a Heterodox Principle. But yet a little farther my Opponent doth manifest his own Absurdities : And how confusedly he blends his own Principles, which create me a great deal of Labour, to reduce to regular Propositions ? If I understand what he intends, and if there is any Propriety in his Words, his Principles centre here, That he believes in God as Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, though he cannot account for these Distinctions ; and that Jesus Christ was a mortal Man, a Prophet influenced by the Spirit of God, as were the preceding Prophets, (only larger in Degree,) as appears by the third Article of his Book ;
and

and although these Names, Jesus Christ were never given to any other Being whatsoever than that very Person, and that he confidereth the Eternal Spirit, and that Person infinitely distinct from each other, yet he borroweth those Names of this Prophet to distinguish the Eternal Spirit, between whom there is so vast a Difference; so that when he speaks of one, we know not whether he means the other; and blends him he calls a Prophet and the Eternal Spirit under the same Terms and Characters, without having any Regard to the Meaning of those Names. For I take it, in these Names, Jesus Christ, there is a particular Significancy, and which, if he allows them to the one, he must deny them to the other. Seeing the Disparity between their Natures is so infinite, I shall first apply them to the Person *William Bromfield* calls a Prophet, and then to the Eternal Spirit, by which we shall see, whether, according to his own System, it is not improper to apply them indifferently to each. The Names, Jesus Christ, in the justest Construction of them, from their Etymologies, is allowed by the Learned, on all hands, to imply an anointed Saviour, Jesus a Saviour, Christ anointed. Now if this Prophet whom *William Bromfield* calls Jesus was not anointed to be a Saviour, then these Names, as they particulatly regarded such an one, could not with any Propriety be given to him, because I understand them not to be what are called proper Names, and given only to distinguish one Person from another, as *John, James, William, Robert*, or the like,

like, but signify and denote the Nature and Quality of that Person who was so anointed; I say, these Names he had no Right to claim or answer to, they being the Property of him who was the anointed Saviour, and therefore, if rightly given to the Eternal Spirit, must be denied to the Man Jesus, and with them the Nature and Quality of his being the anointed Saviour.

That these Names could properly be given to the Eternal Spirit, without being united to some inferior Nature, carries an Absurdity with it; for how can the Eternal Spirit be said to be anointed? For a being anointed, supposes a receiving Commission and Qualification from another; and to say the Eternal Spirit received Commission and Qualification from another, would make a miserable Jarr in his Unitarian Notion: So that it is plain, as these Names cannot properly be given to the Eternal Spirit separately from some inferior Nature, and which Nature must be Human, then it follows, that they must be the Property of some complex Being by a Union of two such Natures, and must be denied to either of those Natures, abstracted from each other; for to assert a simple Human Being capable to sustain those Characters, would be equally as absurd, because no simple Human Being can be a Saviour in such a high Capacity as was asserted of Jesus Christ, (whom *William Bromfield* calls a Prophet only,) but as united to the Divine Nature, and by which [He] Jesus, as Man, was

M anointed

anointed to be a Saviour, *i. e.* received Power and Qualification for that Office, and this Power and Qualification was by virtue of the Divine Nature being united to him; which Arguments prepares my Way to consider these Words of his, Page 28. *And if that* (says William Bromfield) *be allowed, we are agreed that God is called Jesus Christ, and Jesus Christ is God; and the Man Jesus, the great Prophet spoken of Moses, the Messiah or Messenger of the New Covenant.* Here it is manifest to every Impartial Reader, that he makes a Man Jesus, besides Jesus Christ, although in Scripture there is no Foundation given for any such Distinction; for the Name Jesus Christ were never given to any other in all Scriptures, than that Jesus who was born of *Mary*, in whose Name the Holy Ghost was sent. And notwithstanding *William Bromfield* makes this Distinction, here he expresses himself in other ambiguous Terms in other Places, where he says, *It was no Blasphemy in the Son of God, the Eternal Spirit, which came out of the Bosom of the Father, to speak and declare,* although it was the Speech of that very Jesus which he immediately regarded, by which Expressions he denominated him the Son of God, though now here he distinguishes him from the Eternal Spirit, whom he calls Jesus Christ under these Terms, the Man Jesus, the great Prophet, but not a Word of his being the Saviour nor Redeemer of Mankind, for whose Sins he suffered on the Cross; so that he absolutely denies his Divinity, notwithstanding both he and his Ad-
vocate

vocates endeavour to shroud him (under some ambiguous Terms) from the Imputation thereof, by giving the Names Jesus Christ (according to his System) improperly to the Eternal Spirit, which I deny were ever given to him, but as united to Human Nature. And I agree with him no further than this, that God is called Jesus Christ, by uniting himself in Essence to him who was so called : And Jesus Christ is God, as the Human Nature of that Person so called was united to the Divine Nature.

Before my Opponent had made use of these Terms to denominate the Eternal Spirit, he ought first to have shewn they were given to God before the Man Jesus was in being ; and if he had, then he ought not to have given them to a Human Creature, which were the distinguishing Characters of the Creator. But I am of Opinion, he cannot prove that ever God was called Jesus Christ before that Person was in being whose proper Characters I have shewed they were ; and therefore, if he will have the Eternal Spirit called Jesus Christ, distinct from him he calls the Prophet Jesus, then he must borrow those Names from a Creature, to distinguish the Creator ; and then what confused Work will this make ?

But before I shut up these Considerations, it will be necessary to produce the proceeding Words of *William Bromfield* ; which, if the Reader compares with the last quoted, he may see what a miserable Jarr he makes in his own System : *It is both just and reason-*

ble (says William Bromfield) to believe, that God, by his Holy Spirit, called Jesus Christ, or the Word, by John i. 1. did create the Heavens and the Earth, and all Things that therein is; and therefore Paul did right in ascribing these Excellent Expressions to Jesus Christ, the Eternal Spirit, (for Paul knew no other,) that did appear in the bodily Appearance of the Man Jesus, when, he says, he knew him so no more. This William Bromfield owns, and ever did, that God, by his holy Spirit, was in that Body, called Jesus Christ, Matthew xii. 18, 28. Yet still that Body (was no God) without any weak Inference; and Moses's Prophecy of God raising up a Prophet to his People like unto him, stands firm that he was no God.

As these last quoted Sentences contains some particular Assertions, which I apprehend militate against his former Assertions, and which will manifest the Weakness and Absurdity of his way of reasoning, I therefore shall consider them distinctly: In the first Place, I think it would be necessary to enquire what were these Ascriptions Paul gave, and to whom they were given? Whether they were given to Jesus Christ, as he was a Man influenced by the Spirit of God? or to that Influence only by virtue of its Operation in him? or to him, as he was a complex Being, both God and Man? Having propounded these Matters, before I proceed to consider them, I shall produce those excellent Characters and Properties ascribed to Jesus Christ by this great Apostle Paul. The first is Romans ix. 5. *Whose are the Father's; and of whom, as concerning the*
Flesh,

Flesh, Christ came, who is over all, God blessed for ever; Amen. Rom. xiv. 9. For to this End, Christ both died and revived, that he might be Lord both of the Dead and Living, 1 Cor. ii. 8. Which none of the Princes of this World knew; for had they known it, they would not have crucified the Lord of Glory. It would be too tedious to transcribe those various Texts of Scripture which represent Christ as God, and which in a particular Manner pay him Divine Attributions; and therefore I shall refer the Reader to these following, *Phil. iii. 8, 20, 21. 2. Timothy iv. 1. Hebrews i. Ver. 2. to the End.* Now these Characters contained in the Texts before quoted, and many more which might be produced, are ascribed to Jesus Christ, even that very Jesus who was crucified; which confirms my Assertion, that he was both God and Man, because the Properties of both are distinctly ascribed to him; so that these Ascriptions were no more his Due (considered, as in the first Question propounded) than they were the Due of any of the preceding Prophets, or succeeding Apostles. And they equally had as good a Foundation to them as he; for if he was only a Prophet like unto *Moses*, how comes it these or the like Characters were not claimed by, and given to him, as they were to Jesus Christ? And by the same Rule those succeeding him, and even *William Bromfield* himself, who lays Claim to the inward Manifestation of the Eternal Spirit? I say, if Jesus Christ was no more than a Man influenced by the Spirit of God, and yet could properly

properly command and receive his Attributes, then so may every Man who is so influenc'd say he is the Christ of God, and command and receive those Appellations.

Secondly, It doth not appear that these Attributes were given to that Influence, only by virtue of its Operation in him;

1st, Because they are given indifferently to that Person; and which constituted him a Sharer in the Honour of those Appellations.

2dly, Because it is asserted, that the Fulness of the Godhead dwelt bodily (or substantially) in him; *And that it pleased the Father, that in him should all Fulness dwell.*

3dly, and *lastly*, Because there can no Instance be produced from Scripture, that those Characters were ever given to any of the inspired Prophets or Apostles; but that they disclaimed any Right to the proper Characters of the Almighty.

So that upon the whole it doth appear, that the Ascription of those glorious Characters were given to Jesus Christ as he was a complex Being, both God and Man. That he was Man, my Opponent asserts; and that he was God as well as Man, the Scripture declares: As therefore the Appellations of God and Man are given to him in Scripture, we may safely conclude he was both. We are not to enquire the Manner of this Union; it is sufficient that I prove there was such a Union; and which laid the Foundation for the Actions of one, to be attributed to the other; which fully appears from *John*

i. 1. *In the Beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. Ver. 14. And the Word was made Flesh, and dwelt among us. Matt. xvi. 16. And Simon Peter answered and said, Thou art Christ, the Son of the living God. John vi. 69. And we believe and are sure, that thou art that Christ, the Son of the living God. Romans ix. 5. Christ is God over all, blessed for ever: God hath made this Jesus, both Lord and Christ.* Moreover, he is asserted to be the Power and Wisdom of God, called the Lord Jesus Christ, the second Man, the Lord from Heaven, a quickening Spirit. Now all these speak of him as truly and really God. And in the Old Testament, we read of the Son as the Creator, where but little Notice is taken of his Human Nature, in that he had not then taken Flesh on him. But many Hints and Types were exhibited; particularly in that first Promise after the Apostacy of Mankind, *Genesis iii. 13. And I will put Enmity between thee and the Seed of the Woman, and between thy Seed and her Seed: It shall bruise thy Head, and thou shalt bruise his Heel.* Here was an Evident Promise of the Son of God assuming our Nature, and in it suffering for us, intimated in being the Seed of the Woman; he was in that, asserted to be obedient to Death, even the Death of the Cross: And yet he himself declares his Divine Nature, he made himself equal with God; for which, the Jews would have stoned him. For when they queried with him, *Art thou the Christ, the Son of the Blessed?* *Mark xiv. 61. Matthew has it, I adjure thee by the Living God,*
that

that thou tell us whether thou be the Christ, the Son of God? Matthew xxvi. 63, 64. Jesus saith unto him, Thou hast said. As much as to say, thou hast spoke Truth: It is an Answer in the Affirmative to his Question. But Mark has it thus, Mark xiv. 62. in answer to this Question; And Jesus said, I am; and ye shall see the Son of Man sitting on the Right Hand of Power, and coming in the Clouds of Heaven. In short, what he himself affirmed, and what the Jews understood, was, that he made himself God, or equal with him, saying, *In that thou being a Man, makest thy self God.* It is plain then Jesus asserted he was the Son of God, equal with him, and for which the Jews (not believing) crucified him as a Blasphemer.

I come now, in the second Place, to consider these Words of William Bromfield before quoted: *For Paul never knew no other that did appear in the bodily Appearance of the Man Jesus, which he says, he knew him so no more.*

Now, what are we to understand by these Words of his? Would he have us suppose that *this Appearance of the Eternal Spirit, in the bodily Appearance of the Man Jesus,* was the largest Communication of his Influence that ever was? Or, that the Eternal Spirit (described by the Word) precisely understood, was united to the Human Nature of the Man Jesus, and so appeared bodily among Mankind. If he says he means the former; why then he might as well say his influencing of Paul, Peter, John, and Stephen, or any other, was the bodily Appearance of the Eternal Spirit; but

but if the latter, then he wofully contradicts his former Assertions : But yet a little further he says, *Still that Body was no God.*

Now here is *Bromfield* in his own Colours : What Jargon and Inconsistency is here? If this be allow'd for Reasoning, then I confess I must alter my Notions of it; for by the same Rule, I may implead the Man Jesus being a Prophet, and say that the Human Soul, assisted by the Spirit of God, was in that Body, but yet that Body was no Prophet. Nay, I may carry it farther, and say that the Human Soul was in that Body, but yet that Body was no Man; for whenever the Soul and Body are disjoined, (in a strict and proper Sense,) the Denomination Man is taken away. And what should I be thought, if I had pursued such a Way of Disputing? I confess I should have been conscious of the Contempt of my Reader. But to return: The same may be said of Jesus Christ; The Body was no more a Part of his complex Person, than the Body is a Part of the Man; for the Body is not the Soul, nor the Soul the Body; and yet the Union of these constitute a Man: Nor can he be denominated Man without either of these; for the one is as necessary to the Denomination, as the other:

But however, the Question between us was not whether the Body of Jesus Christ was God? nor indeed, can I but wonder that my Opponent should suppose any such Thing, seeing that he calls the Man Jesus a Prophet; and can it be supposed our Controversy was confined to a Body simply, for which we can

N

have

have but a single Idea, and is of itself inanimate, and therefore would be absurd to assert it a Man, and so consequently not a Prophet, without joining some Energy or Life to it, by which it must be denominated an active Thinking Being; so that by his way of asserting (for I will not call it reasoning) I may as safely say that the Body of Jesus was not a Man.

But on the contrary, I plead that that Body had the Properties of a Man join'd to it, by which it was a Human Being; and also the Eternal God united this Being to himself, and thereby was a complex Being; so that by the Properties of a Human Being he was denominated Man, and by the Properties of the Divine Nature he was denominated God, by virtue of those Natures being united in that one Person, and therefore might properly be denominated from either of those Natures.

Upon the whole, I believe that the Expressions of my Opponent before quoted were designed, in some Measure, to cast a Veil over his own Doctrine, and to bring an Absurdity upon mine, as if I went about to assert a Body of Flesh (simply consider'd, and without any regard to the Properties which possess'd it) was God; whereas it is manifest it was not intended by me, nor is it inferable from my Words. All that I assert is, that Jesus Christ was a complex Being; that he had the Properties of God and Man, * And therefore the Actions of the one were properly

‘ly attributed to the other, and might justly
‘take its Denomination from both Natures.’

I come now to Page 30. of *William Bromfield's* Reply, where I meet with a Re-assumption of his former Assertion, relating to the Seed being in the Male; and not in the Female, in these Words: *And I think and believe, as all Physicians know, that the Seed of any Generation is in the Male, and not in the Female.*

To which I have before observed, that it is an undetermined Point among the Learned; and to take a Thing for granted, which is still in dispute, is not like an Impartial Author.

But suppose I were to grant that Point, which I will not, because I, who am no Physician, can make several Exceptions to it, were it a Debate proper to be Part of the Subject of a religious Controversy? But it would be undecent to make publick any such Arguments, as are necessary to the Discussion thereof, in any Book, unless professedly wrote on that Subject; because it may be perused by Readers who may not be duly qualified to be acquainted with such Reasonings, it being a Matter fit for the Consideration and Decision of Anatomists.

But I say, suppose it was out of the Question, would my Opponent assert that the Term Seed, made use of in Scripture, in a figurative Sense, was design'd to be confin'd to the physical Use of the Word, and that it never regarded any Thing else than the particular Property proceeding from the Male? Will he say that it was never made

use of to regard the Off-spring of Mankind, without the particular Mode of Generation? That it was so made use of in Scripture, is set forth in many Places. The Transcription, for Brevity, I omit: The Term Seed therefore was made use of in Scripture in a figurative Sense, which was Synonymous to the Fruit of *David's* Loins, and so was Jesus mediately by *Mary*, but not at all by *Joseph*.

Therefore, supposing his Assertion was right, (which I say I will not allow,) yet as the Term Seed was not used in the Physical Sense, which *William Bromfield* hath construed it to, so he hath not from thence any Foundation for his Argument. Indeed, I confess thus far, if he had shewn that the Word was never used in any Sense but what it physically implies, then his Assertion stood fairer to be defended; but for him to put a different Construction upon it than what in Scripture it figuratively means, doth thereby truly revert upon himself his false Charge on me, of *changing the Sense and Intention of the Scriptures*.

Moreover, if there is any Meaning in the Apostle *Paul's* Words, (and if my Opponent will not object their being irrational,) I think he settles this Point exactly, and also asserts it as evident, that *Mary* was of the House of *Juda*. In the first Place, *Gal. iv. 4. But when the Fulness of Time came, God sent forth his Son, made of a Woman, made under the Law.*

Will *William Bromfield* deny this Testimony, or will he say I change the Sense of Scripture? [He,] *Paul*, declares Jesus, the Son of God, was

was made of a Woman, not begotten by Man, but made : Man is not so much as mentioned to have any concern in the Production of this Holy Jesus, *the Only-begotten of the Father*. So that if we consider him as made or begotten, it was only the Work of God ; and for this Reason, he was long before called the Seed of the Woman, *Genesis* iii. 14. As then it is evident Jesus was made of a Woman, which Woman was the *Virgin Mary*, of whom he came, so, secondly, it is asserted by the same Apostle, that he came out of *Juda* in these Words, *Hebrews* vii. 14. *For it is evident that our Lord sprang out of Juda, of which Tribe Moses spake nothing concerning their Priesthood*. Now if this doth not fully and amply prove that *Mary* was of the House of *Juda*, then nothing must be allowed for Proof (by him) but what quadrates with his Deistical Notions. For, first, it is asserted he was made of a Woman, which will not be denied was *Mary*, the Wife of *Joseph* ; and, secondly, that he sprang out of *Juda*. So that unless it can be shewn, in Opposition to this Text, that he was not made of a Woman, but begotten by Man, as *William Bromfield* asserts, it will remain as an undoubted Proof, *Mary* was of the House of *Juda*, or else it could not be truly said that our Lord sprang out of *Juda*.

I come now to Page 31. As the last Paragraph of Page 29. will come under my Notice in the Examination of Pages 39, 40. I pass by it here, and take notice that the following Words of *William Bromfield* doth militate strongly against himself, and also
his

his Partiality will appear to the Words he makes use of. *But if Henton Brown will reason, and say, that the Seed of the Woman [her Children] should bruise the Serpent's Head, I allow it in a right Sense; but then he must prove the Woman had a Seed to generate without the Help of a Man.* Now observe, in the first Place, he allows the Woman has Seed, though here he will have it in the figurative Sense, (*the Seed of the Woman, her Children,*) but will not allow it when made use of to Jesus; for then he will understand it only in the physical Sense of the Word: But even in this he is unfair, for the Text only speaks in the singular Number, *He shall bruise thy Head, and thou shalt bruise his Heel;* so that it was not *the Children of the Woman,* but [the Child,] the Seed of the Woman; and as this Prophecy particularly regarded Christ, described as the Offspring of the Woman, under the Term Seed, so it is very evident from the Scriptures of Truth, that he was produced without the Help of a Man, or else it would have been incongruous so evidently to contradistinguish him from the rest of Mankind, under the Term *the Seed of the Woman.*

But pray, Reader, what right Sense is this our Author will allow it in? Hath he got any particular Sense to himself he is ashamed to let the World know? or would he have us take it in the wrong Sense, rather than the right, that he keeps his right Sense to himself? How dull and insipid is this for an *aged Detector,* to fault me with Errors, when he is so deficient and wanting to Mankind, as not to let them

them know this right Sense he will allow it in?

But a little farther, after he has left us in the Dark, as to his right Sense, he says, *I must prove the Woman had a Seed to generate without the Help of a Man.*

To which I have already observed, that in the ordinary Course of Nature, although a Woman hath a Seed, she cannot generate without the physical Operation of the Male, no more can the Male without the Use of the Female: But that by the special Interposition of God, contrary to the Course of Nature, a Woman may conceive, is allowed by my Opponent, Page 44. of his Reply. I Plead therefore, according to the Holy Scripture, that the Conception of Jesus was by the Special and Miraculous Power of the Almighty, who disposed the Womb of *Mary* to conceive, and bring forth a Child; contrary to the common Nature of Things, and which was doubtful to herself, by her Query when the Angel appeared to her, *Luke 34. How shall this be, seeing I know not a Man!* The Strangeness of the Prognostication raising this Query in her: But that as she had Faith in the All-sufficiency of God's Power, the Angel removed her Scruples, by reminding her, *That with God all Things were possible.* And farther, to render the Thing to her more probable, he tells her the Cause and Means by which she should conceive, *Ver. 35. The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the Power of the Highest shall overshadow thee; therefore also, that Holy Thing which shall be born of thee, shall be called the Son of*

of God, Ver. 38. *And Mary said, behold the Handmaid of the Lord, be it unto me according to thy Word.* She resolves all her Considerations into an humble Dependance upon the All-sufficiency of God's Power, and an entire Resignation to his Will, as knowing he was able to perform whatsoever he promised; so that it is evident from hence, that she did conceive by the Special and Miraculous Over-shadowing of the Holy Ghost. And it is highly reasonable to believe, that he, who by his own Word, formed an indigested Chaos into Order, and who from the Earth formed Man, and made him a living Intelligent Being, who said, *Let there be Light, and it was so*; who bedecked the Heavens with innumerable Glories, and performed a thousand ! thousand ! Wonders more ; I say, it is reasonable for us to believe, that he, whose Power in the Beginning was able to make Man of a Lump of Clay, could by the same Power, give Conception to a Woman, and cause her to conceive without the natural Assistance of a Man ; and it cannot be construed less than Blasphemy, to deny it. It is plain (if Scripture be allowed for Proof, as it ought in this Case, as well as in any other, because it is so positively and distinctly asserted) that first, according to that early Promise of God. *Genesis iii. 14. The Seed of the Woman should bruise the Serpent's Head,* which Seed is Christ ; and, secondly, that she did conceive without the Help of a Man, not only by the Texts before quoted, but also by *Matthew i. 25. And he knew her not,*

not, till she had brought forth her first-born Son. And John the Evangelist, the Bosom Disciple of our Lord, positively asserts him to be the Only-begotten of the Father, full of Grace, and full of Truth. John i.

William Bromfield proceeds, Page 31. and says, *I am ashamed of the Ignorance of this poor Man, that cannot distinguish Jesus Christ after the Flesh, and Jesus Christ after the Spirit.*

But I think he has more Occasion to be ashamed of his own Ignorance, or wilful Per-
 version of the Sense of the Words: For pray what Distinction is there between Jesus Christ and Jesus Christ; he would have me distinguish, where there is no Distinction at all; nor do I know that ever the Scriptures distinguish'd the Person of Jesus Christ, as he here has done, *Jesus Christ after the Flesh, and Jesus Christ after the Spirit.*

For he never can shew that these Names were given to the Flesh and Spirit, in Opposition or Contradistinction to each other; or that they were, or could properly be given to either Nature separate from each other: But suppose we take it according to his Argument; if Jesus Christ after the Flesh (as he calls him) was no more than a mere Man, it was highly improper to denominate the Eternal Spirit by his Names (as I have before observed:) Nay, if William Bromfield was influenced by the Spirit of God, he might by the same Rule call the Eternal Spirit William Bromfield, and then put me to make a Distinction between William Bromfield after the Flesh, and William Bromfield after the

O

the Spirit; but at least, to make his Words any way congruous, it infers thus much, that there were two Natures to be distinguish'd in the Person of Jesus Christ, inwhom he would have me make this Distinction, the one Divine, the other Human, and that he supposes I did not rightly distinguish between those Natures; but then it must be allowed he regarded two Natures in that one Person; for it is very apparent, as he would have this Distinction in one and the self-same Being, that there must be two Natures to be distinguished; For *Jesus Christ after the Flesh* is his Human Nature, which my Opponent allows in these Words, *The first undoubtedly was mere Man.*

Now here he allows and pleads, that the Human Nature was one Property of his Being; and secondly, the Divine Nature he supposes the other, is plain from the Distinction he would have me make, *Jesus Christ after the Spirit.*

So that as this is still predicated of the same Being, in whom he says I must make the Distinction before quoted, it argues from his own Words, that the Divine Nature was a Property of that Being; or it would have been Nonsense for him to put me to make a Distinction from the other Property of this Being. The Divine and Human Natures he must allow from his own Words, immediately actuated that Human Body, and which necessarily supposes a Union of those Natures; and therefore, notwithstanding he excepts against my Phrases of God and Man, yet here he impli-

implicitly allows them, if this Distinction (he would have me make) hath any Validity in it.

That I did distinguish between the Divine and Human Natures of Jesus Christ, is evident, because I said he was both God and Man; and absolutely infers a Difference in those Natures, because we form different Ideas of their Properties; I did not blend the Natures together, and say, the Divine was the Human, and the Human the Divine; but that they were so united in that Person, as that he might as properly take his Denomination from one Nature, as the other, and could as truly be denominated God as Man, and Man as well as God.

I come now to the last Paragraph of Page 31. where are these Words; *And for his quoting all these Sayings of Isaiah, 'tis only to fill up his Book; for I have often said, I own them all in the Sense they were spoke and intended.*

Reader, I appeal to thee, whether this is like a Disputant, to tell the World he owns these Texts in the Sense they were spoke and intended, and yet not tells us what he thinks was intended by them? He must be very ignorant to think there is any Argument in those Expressions.

These Sayings of *Isaiah*, which I quoted, did regard Jesus Christ, or they did not: If they did, we are to consider in what Respect they regarded him; if they did not, then his Business was to shew these Quotations had no Relation to him. But if the Reader will peruse them, and compare with the Evangelists and Apostles, he will see how far,

and in what Sense, they regarded Jesus Christ, and which fully proves him God as well as Man, as my own Opponent is forced to acknowledge in the following Page, although he confusedly endeavours to shift the Weight which he had brought upon himself, first citing these Words; *That I am ignorant of this Child that is to be born: Unto us a Son is given, and the Government shall be upon his Shoulders.* He adds, 'I would fain have *Henton Brown* resolve himself whether this Child was not Jesus Christ, the eternal Spirit, begotten and born in all true Believers; for if it was to be the Man Jesus, it would be hard to find where the Government ought to be put on his Shoulders, or that he, as Man, should be called the *Wonderful Counsellor, the Mighty God, the everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace.* But as it is plainly meant to be the eternal Spirit God in him, it is plain all these Attributes are his Due, as called *Jesus Christ.*'

I have given this at large, because if any Body wants a Copy of Absurdities, here is one for them: I have no Occasion to take Notice of every Part of it, because the most of it, if not all, carries its own Refutation: In the first Place, he would insinuate, that this Prophecy of *Isaiah* did not relate to Jesus, the Child to be born of *Mary*, but to the eternal Spirit, begotten and born in the Hearts of true Believers; which I utterly deny, because this Prophecy hath immediate Relation to him, as appears by *Isaiah ix. 7.* *Of the Increase of his Government, and Peace, there shall be no End upon*

upon the Throne of David, and upon his Kingdom, to order and establish it with Judgment; and which refers to *Luke i. 32, 33*. So that this Prophecy did regard that Jesus to be born of Mary, and therefore not the Operation of the Holy Spirit in the Hearts of Believers; and so strongly asserts his Divinity, as that *William Bromfield* can never overthrow, and proves substantially he was God and Man: A Child he was to be born, which infers his human Nature; and he also was *Wonderful Counsellor, the mighty God, the everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace*, which proves his divine Nature, and therefore all the Attributes of God were his Due, which otherwise he had no Claim to, nor could he, without being guilty of Blasphemy, receive them.

Upon which Foundation Omniscience was his Property, given to and received by him; and although my Opponent hath done what he could to invalidate the Proofs I brought to maintain it, yet if the Reader judiciously considers the Contents of the succeeding Paragraph, he will see what Jargon there is. *Page 32.* ‘ Pray Reader stop, and examine ‘ whether *John* the Divine was speaking of ‘ the Man Jesus, or of the eternal Spirit by ‘ that Name; for the Man Jesus being gone, ‘ there was no other Jesus Christ left but the ‘ Spirit of God, which had been in Jesus, ‘ and after he was dead, came in his Name ‘ to all who believed in him; as also consider how Jesus Christ was crucified afresh ‘ after Jesus Christ the Prophet was dead and ‘ risen; as also how did *Paul* persecute Jesus ‘ Christ

' Christ after his Crucifixion : It is plain it
 ' was not the Man Jesus, but it was God's
 ' holy Spirit, which came in Jesus Christ's
 ' Name ;' and then adds, ' How *Henton Brown*
 ' can imagine to put upon any Man (that
 ' hath tasted of the good Word of God, and
 ' the Powers of the World to come) these
 ' Things, to attribute to mortal Man the
 ' Things only due to God alone, I cannot
comprehend ' comprehend, unless he thinks us all as blind
 ' and ignorant as himself, who is yet in
 ' Confusion.' I have also transcribed this Pa-
 ragraph at large, that the Reader may judge
 who is blind and ignorant, and likewise to
 let his Abettors see what an Advocate they
 have got for their Cause.

But though it is designed to invalidate the
 Proofs I brought for the Omniscience of Jesus
 Christ, in Page 43. of my Examination, yet
 it is so far from answering his Purpose, that
 it is a mere Contradiction to himself : Here
 is *Bromfield* against *Bromfield*. I have no Oc-
 casion to be his Opponent here ; for he is
 in Opposition to himself, and without any
 Animadversions of mine. If the Reader will
 consider the whole Paragraph, he may rea-
 dily perceive his Contradiction, and at the
 same Time give Judgment whether these
 most absurd Assertions invalidates the Proofs
 I brought in Page 33. of my *Examination*, for
 the Omniscience of Jesus Christ, which were
Rev. ii. 23. And I will kill her Children with
Death, and all the Churches shall know that I
am he which searcheth the Reins and Hearts, and
will give unto every one of you according to your
Works

Works. Joh. xxi. 17. He saith unto him the third Time, Simon, Son of Jonas, lovest thou me? Peter was grieved, because he said unto him the third Time, lovest thou me? And he said unto him, Lord, thou knowest all Things, thou knowest that I love thee; Jesus saith unto him, feed my Sheep. To which I add, John xvi. 30. Now are we sure that thou knowest all Things, and needest not that any Man should ask thee; by this we believe that thou camest forth from God. And John ii. 25. And needed not that any should testify of Men; for he knew what was in Man. Now as all these Texts asserts his Omniscience in the highest and most exalted Sense of the Word; so unless he can invalidate their Authority, they remain as substantial Evidences against him, which I believe he cannot do, though he may reject them as irrational, as he doth the latter Part of the first Chapter of Matthew.

He distinguishes that it was not given to the Man Jesus, but to the eternal Spirit, by whom he was influenced; which I deny: For it was ascribed to that very individual Jesus Christ, born of *Mary*, without any Distinction, from the eternal Spirit; and therefore, as the Attribution of *knowing the Hearts of all Men, and all Things*, was given to and received by him, he either had a Right to it, or he had not; if he had not, there is no Medium left; but that we must conclude it Blasphemy in him to claim that as his Property which was only the Property of God. If *William Bromfield* can shew how the Properties of the Almighty can be ascribed to a Creature
by

by virtue of its being influenced by the Spirit of God, he will do something worthy of Note ; but sure I am he can never shew it, neither from Scripture, or the Reason and Nature of Things.

But he proceeds, taking little Notice of Omnipresence, another Property of God, and which I shewed Jesus Christ asserted of himself in so emphatical a Manner, and in such Characters, which expressly takes in his human Nature as a Sharer in that Attribute, *Mat. xviii. 20. For wheresoever two or three are gathered together in my Name, there am I in the Midst of them. John iii. 13. And no Man hath ascended up to Heaven, but he that came down from Heaven, even the Son of Man, which is in Heaven.* Here Christs asserts his Omnipresence even as Son of Man ; which were impossible, unless intimately united with the Godhead, as I have in divers Places observed.

William Bromfield proceeds, and says, ' Whereas *Henton Brown* says, that the Man Jesus claimed to himself Omnipotence, is a downright Lye. See *Mat. xviii.* from the twelfth Verse to the twentieth, &c. and when he says, *Were two or three are gathered together in my Name, there am I in the Midst of them,* this he speaks in the Name of God, and not of himself.'

Now I would query who *William Bromfield* gives the Lye to, the Scriptures or *Henton Brown*? One or other it must be : *Henton Brown* it cannot belong to; for he hath produced plain Texts of Scripture for his Assertion, and therefore the Lye must be given to the Scriptures:

where

tures? But who do these two Lyes belong to? First to assert, (that what Christ said, *Mat. xviii. 20. That where two or three were gathered together in his Name, he would be in the Midst of them,*) that he spake it in the Name of God, and not of himself; whereas he speaks in the Pronoun I, and expressly asserts his own Presence to them, who are gathered in his Name, (or Power,) which if he had been the real Son of Joseph, and so consequently a mere Creature, how could he presume so to speak?

And secondly *William Bromfield* asserts, 'Henton Brown says the Man Jesus claimed Omnipotence to himself.' I say who do these two Lyes belong to? I will not say to *William Bromfield*, I leave that to the Reader; whereas I said *Christ claimed Omnipotence to himself*; for turn to the Place where I plead Omnipresence as a Property of Jesus Christ, I say thus; *Omnipresence Christ claimed to himself*; and when I come to Omnipotence, I say, *Omnipotence is given to him*; having immediate ~~Relation~~ *reference* to the personal Distinction of Christ in the Assertion of his Omnipresence; and under the Term *Christ* I intend and include both his divine and human Natures, as well as when I say Jesus Christ, which is very frequent in Scripture: But that I asserted the Man Jesus, simply consider'd as Man, claimed Omnipotence, is false; nor will I allow the Distinction: But that Jesus Christ claimed it, and was properly attributed to him by virtue of the Union of those Natures, is fully evident in Scripture: That Christ then claimed Omnipotence, the Scrip-

tures declare ; and he either had a Title to it, or he had not ; if he had not, he must be a Blasphemer, to challenge and receive it : But sure the bare mentioning this is shocking to every Christian !

William Bromfield, hath in divers Places of his Book, falsely charged me with leaving out Words which would fully explain his Meaning : And here he manifests his Partiality and Unfairness to a great Degree ; for where he quotes the Text of Scripture brought by me for Proof of my Assertion, that Part which is most material to the Point, he leaves out, which I will here transcribe exactly, as it is in Page 34. of my *Examination*, *John v. 19, 21. Then answered Jesus, and said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, the Son can do nothing of himself, but what he seeth the Father do ; for what Things soever he doth, these also doth the Son likewise. Ver. 21. For the Father raiseth up the Dead, and quickeneth them, even so the Son quickeneth whom he will : Whereas William Bromfield* hath quoted only this ; *Verily, I say unto you, the Son can do nothing of himself, but what he seeth the Father do ;* and so proceeds to animadvert upon it. But in the Text, as I have justly quoted it, the Omnipotence of the Son is asserted in as full and as an extensive a Manner as the Father's ; for *whatsoever (without any Exception) the Father doth, these also doth the Son ;* and for Proof of the Equality of their Omnipotence, he instances in the twenty first Verse, *For the Father raiseth up the Dead, and quickeneth them, even so the Son quickeneth whom he will.* Here is plainly the Pro-

Property of Omnipotence lodged in the Will of the Son: He doth not say whom the Father pleases to order, and influence me to raise up and quicken, but he *quickens whom he will*. Moreover, it doth farther appear, from Phil. iii. 21. *Who shall change our vile Body, that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious Body, according to the Working, whereby he is able to subdue all Things to himself*. If this is not Omnipotence, I know not what is; and that it particularly respects Jesus Christ, the foregoing Verse is a sufficient Evidence.

Again, his Omnipotence is fully proved by another plain Assertion of our Lord, *All Power is given to me in Heaven and in Earth*; and as that which is given, becomes the Property of him to whom it is given, so Omnipotence Christ claimed as his Property: Mistake me not, this Property was not communicative to the divine Nature, because it has it originally in itself; nor is it communicative to human Nature, but only as partaking of it in Union with the Divine.

Furthermore, it appears by John x. 17, 18. *Therefore doth my Father love me, because I lay down my Life, that I might take it again, Ver. 18. No Man taketh it from me, but I lay it down of my self; I have Power to lay it down, and I have Power to take it again*.

Now in these Jesus Christ regards himself, even in his Divine and Human Natures. His Life which he had Power to lay down, was his Human Nature; and his Divine Nature was the Power by which he did both lay it down, and take it again; he speaks in the

Personal Pronoun and equally asserts, the Life he had Power to lay down, and the Power to take it again, were the Properties of his Being. But I believe I have sufficiently strengthened my Assertion of his Omnipotence; and therefore I come now to consider *William Bromfield's* Arguments against Jesus Christ's Immortality. He says, *It's true it was ascribed to Christ, but not to the Man Jesus.* Now here he disjoins Christ from the Man Jesus, and so insinuates, that Christ and the Man Jesus are two distinct Beings; although in other Places, he calls the same Person, who he here calls the Man Jesus, Jesus Christ; and so he will have Jesus Christ after the Flesh, and Jesus Christ after the Spirit; and here he disjoins Christ from the Man Jesus, as though he were another Being disjunct from him: Whereas it is evident in Scripture, that these Terms, although used separately, regarded one and the self-same Person, but my Opponent says, Immortality was ascribed to Christ, and so hath conceded to my Argument; for the Word Christ signifies (anointed,) and therefore he says, Immortality is ascribed to the (Anointed,) who was Jesus Christ; for he was anointed to be a Saviour, and thus hath he fairly acknowledged to one Attribution given to Jesus Christ in Scripture.

Moreover I say, still Immortality was ascribed to Jesus Christ; and what my Opponent hath brought to the contrary, no ways touches my Proofs, nor is any way pertinent to his Argument, but rather strengthens my Assertion. He owns, *that Immortality dwells*

dwells in the Light, which Light is Jesus Christ, the Word; which I readily allow, that Immortality dwells in the Word, which was in the Beginning with God, which Word took Flesh, to whom the Denomination, Jesus Christ was given. The Word never was called Jesus Christ, till it was made (or took) Flesh, and assumed our Nature into a personal Union with itself; by which the one was the Property of that Person, as well as the other, and the Properties and Actions of each Nature, were indifferently ascribed and given.

But further it appears, that Immortality Jesus Christ claimed to himself, from *John viii. 58. Jesus said unto them, verily, verily I say unto you, before Abraham was, I AM.*

Which * would not be Sense, unless it is understood. 'The [I AM,] and these Terms 'God made use of, to signify who he was, by 'his Servant *Moses*, in his Message to *Pharaoh*; and this Jesus Christ asserted of himself; and also *Rev. xxii. 13. I am Alpha and Omega, the Beginning and the End, the First and the Last*: And that this was he who my Opponent calls the Man Jesus, the Son of *David*, is emphatically asserted in *Ver. 26. I Jesus, have sent my Angel to testify unto you these Things in the Churches; I am the Root and Off-spring of David, and the Bright and Morning Star.*

What more need I to say to prove his Immortality, when he himself hath so fully asserted it in such plain and express Terms; and that we should be sure it is the same Jesus Christ, he declares, as an Evidence of it, he

* *Taylor's Divinity of Christ.*

he is the Off-spring of *David*, as well as the Bright and Morning Star.

I come now to *William Bromfield's* Objection against the *Immutability* of *Jesus Christ*, where he says, *The Apostle was not speaking of the Man Jesus, he being dead and risen, but of Jesus Christ's second coming.*

I say the Apostle was speaking of the same *Jesus Christ* who suffered on the Cross for our Redemption, as is evident by *Hebrews xiii. 12. Wherefore Jesus also, that he might sanctify the People with his own Blood, suffered without the Gate,* And this hath reference to that *Jesus Christ* whom the same Apostle asserts, *Is the same Yesterday, and to Day, and for ever,* *Hebrews xiii. 18.* and therefore consequently proves his *Immutability*.

But my Opponent further asserts, that *Immutability* could not regard the *Man Jesus*, because he changed, and died.

That there was a Cessation of Action from the Body, I grant; but that even the Body itself saw any Corruption; I deny the contrary being firmly asserted by the Apostle *Peter*, alluding to the Prophecy of *David*, *Psalms xvi. 10. He seeing this before, spake of the Resurrection of Christ, that his Soul was not left in Hell, neither his Flesh did see Corruption.* So that notwithstanding it pleased him, according to his own Expressions, to lay down his Life, for which Purpose, he assumed Human Nature, and united it himself, by virtue of which Union it was called his Life, or otherways could not properly be
so

so accounted; I say, notwithstanding he laid down his Life, *i. e.* his Human Nature, for a time, yet it was the same individual Body which he raise; and it was the same Divine Eternal Word which assumed it again; of which there were several Testimonials, that it was the same Body, the Holy Apostles, and even *Thomas* himself, were sufficient Evidences; and that it was the same Eternal Word, is confirmed by his performing divers infallible Acts of Divinity after his Resurrection, of which the Apostles and Disciples were likewise Witnesses. Let it not be supposed that I am about to maintain Immutability as a Property of the Man Jesus, simply consider'd as a Man, as *William Bromfield* would suggest, but that the Right which Jesus Christ had to this Attribution is founded on the Union of the Divine and Human Natures, as I have constantly maintained, for his receiving the several other divine Attributions.

Furthermore, my Opponent saith, that the Texts I brought, *viz.* *Hebrews* i. 10, 11, 12, &c. hath no relation but to God himself. And so say I? If Jesus Christ be allowed to be God; which indeed he himself in some Places allows, by calling *Jesus Christ the Eternal Spirit, the Son of God*: But I say that the before-quoted Texts hath particular Relation to that Jesus who suffered on the Cross, which expressly proves him the Son of God; and if the Reader will look from the 5th to the 12th Verse, he will plainly see it, I shall mention the 6th Verse in particular. And again, when he
bringeth

bringeth the First (or Only) begotten into the World, he saith, and let all the Angels of God Worship him.

Now who was this First (or Only) begotten, whom the Angels of God were to worship? If it was not that Person whom my Opponent calls the Man Jesus, I would gladly know who it was. There is no Medium between his being, and not being the Person; and if it is allowed he was, then the preceding and succeeding Verses proves the same Holy One to be the Son of God, because they have immediate Relation and Correspondence with each other, and point particularly to him; so that the proper Characters of the Almighty are given to him, who was there called the First (or Only) begotten, as is evident, by Verse 8. *But unto the Son, he saith, thy Throne, O God, is for ever and ever; a Sceptre of Righteousness is the Sceptre of thy Kingdom.* Here the Term God, in the Vocative Case, is given expressly to the Son, who was the First (or Only) begotten, and so expressly and positively proves him God.

Moreover, Worship, in the ultimate Sense of it, and which is the peculiar Property of God, is by the before-quoted Text commanded to be given to the First (or Only) begotten, even by the highest Class of Creatures, *Let all the Angels of God worship him.* As then he is the Object of the Angels Worship, so consequently of Mankind, who are inferior to Angels; and as thus he is the Object of Divine Worship, he must be the supreme God, or else my Opponent must allow him

a Subordinate God; and then, contrary to his own System, he must allow more Gods than one. From all which it is evident, the before quoted Texts, viz. *Hebrews i. 10, 11, 12, &c.* have ample Relation to that same Person (whom *William Bromfield* calls the Man Jesus,) or else he must shew in Opposition to him who was the First (or Only) begotten, whom the Angels of God were to worship.

I turn now to Page 36. As to Page 34, 35. they being Reassumptions of his former Assertions, back'd with some ridiculous Animadversions, not becoming one who would be thought a wise and grave Disputant, and is rather the Subject of Banter, than fitting so serious a Controversy. My Opponent insists, *That the Evangelists, Matthew, Luke, and John, do own Jesus to be the Son of Joseph, and did give their Genealogies to prove him so.*

To which I still maintain a Negation, that either of them owned *Joseph* to be the real Father of Jesus, but that they acknowledged him no other than the supposed Father; and which *Luke* is very particular in *Luke iii. 23.* And *Jesus himself began to be about Thirty Years of Age, being (as was supposed) the Son of Joseph.* That the Genealogy was given to prove Jesus the real Son of *Joseph*, I still deny; but to prove *Mary* of the House of *David*, I have already shewn, which my Opponent hath not excepted against; and therefore I have no Reason to say any Thing more about it, until he hath invalidated my Assertions and Proofs in that Particular. But pray observe for Proof, that the Evangelists confirms *Wil-*

liam Bromfield's Assertion, he says, For not only Philip and Nathaniel owned him the Son of Joseph, Matthew, Luke, and John, do the same, by inserting the Opinions of the People, which they believed, or they would not have put it in their Gospels.

That *Philip* and *Nathaniel* owned Jesus as the real Son of *Joseph*, I shall not allow without Proof; for they only distinguished him under the common suppositious Character, as he was generally reputed by the *Jews*. That the Evangelists believed it, because they inserted it in their Gospels, is an Argument I leave to the Readers to judge; for by this absurd Way of Reasoning, he might say, when the People upbraided Jesus with casting out Devils by *Belzebub* the Prince of Devils, that the Evangelists believed it, or they would not have put it in their Gospels, and so consequently make them Believers in all the Opinions of the People concerning him: The which, if not Presumption, then what is? Whereas they acted the Part of Historians, whose Business it was to be impartial, and relate the most material Occurrences and Circumstances of his Life, and the Opposition he met with by Gainsayers. But if the Evangelists be credited by my Opponent in some Parts of their Gospels, which he may suppose favours his Opinion, what Reason can be shewn, why Credence shall not be given to them in the other Parts thereof; and notwithstanding, he hath taken an Advantage, (as he supposes) from an Error of the Press, in Page 39. of my Examination, yet, I say, the

the Matter I quoted is in that Chapter I intended, which was *Matthew* i. 18. whereas it is printed *Matthew* 18. though I suppose it would not have pass'd with him, had it been printed right ; because he rejects the latter End of that Chapter as irrational ; but I know not who gave him the Authority to allow no Scripture for Canonical, but what quadrates with his Deistical Opinion,

But he proceeds, quoting *Luke* i. 31. *He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Highest, and the Lord God shall give unto him the Throne of his Father David.* This (says William Bromfield) has no Relation as to making him a God, it only confirms that he was the Son of David ; having a Promise annexed, that he should be called the Son of the Highest. But how came this Promise to be annexed ? For what Reason, if he was not the Son of the Highest, then it was only a mock Title, and the Promise without any just Foundation : But he either was, or was not the Son of the Highest, and so that Title properly or improperly given him ; if properly, then he was the Son of the Highest ; if improperly, then that Promise was only fictitious, and not to be regarded : But whether we shall receive my Opponent's Paraphrase, and reject the Text, or bring an apparent Absurdity upon it, I shall leave every one who reads, to judge for himself ; for my Part, I am already determined about it.

But if the Reader will pursue the Remainder of this Page, he will see more of *William Bromfield's*

Bromfield's Inconsistencies ; a Specimen of which I will here produce :

But as to the Man Jesus, his Reign among his Apostles and Disciples was but short, not three Years ; but his Spiritual Kingdom, which is his second Coming by the Spirit in the Name of Jesus Christ, is to be, and is known to be an everlasting Kingdom.

Now observe, the Antecedent is the [Man Jesus,] and the subsequent [his] hath direct Relation to the same Antecedent; so that he expressly pleads, that the Man Jesus comes a *second Time by the Spirit*, and hath a *Spiritual Kingdom, which is to be an everlasting Kingdom.* And how this will agree with his Assertion, that he was but a mortal Man, is very unaccountable.

But I intended only two or three Hints to these particular Sentences ; for whatever Reader (who in the very least Manner is acquainted with the Use of Words) peruses that Part of his Page 37. must (I think) agree that I have not misconstrued his Words in any Respect, but that they naturally import the same as I have observed, and the Use which he from thence may make of them, needs not any further Observations of mine. I proceed to Page 28. Paragraph 2. he having in the first Paragraph in a very angry Mood, discharged me from the Obligation of the Proof of *Mary's* being of the House of *Judah.* For he says, *no body disputes it farther, than it is not proved by Holy Writ.*

But pray what Proof would he have farther than the Proof of Holy Writ ? And how far

far is it proved by Scripture? In my Opinion it is so plainly proved, as that my Opponent cannot invalidate; for if he could, I believe he would have laid strong Siege against it: However, as he seems not willing to enter further into that Dispute, I have no Occasion to contend where there is no need of Contention; and also, before I advance any further Proofs, let him invalidate those I have already brought, only I will add that of *Luke i. 2, 3, 4, 5.* *And all went to be taxed, every one into his own City, Ver. 4. And Joseph also went up from Galilee out of the City of Nazareth unto Judea, unto the City of David, which is called Bethlehem, (because he was of the House and Lineage of David.) Ver. 5. To be taxed with Mary his espoused Wife, being great with Child.* From which Texts it is evident, that as every one was to be taxed, and they were to go into their own Cities to be taxed, so Mary was of the House of *David*, as well as *Joseph*, because she went with him to be taxed into *Judea*. I shall now leave this Matter, having added the foregoing to back my former Assertions on that Head, and turn to Page 40. where I come to consider, in its proper Place, my Opponent's Assertion, that I make *more Gods than one*, which I took Notice of before.

William Bromfield says, *It's very well at last Henton Brown begins to flag, and be weary of his Plurality of Gods; and now he knows not of any Body that asserts the Consubstantiality of Jesus Christ with God the Father; nor any who will have God to be Man, and Man to be God.*

In

In the first Place I remark, that although my Opponent hath exploded me for leaving out Words, and putting in others, although he hath not given any one Instance, yet in this Quotation from Page 43. of my Examination, he hath manifested himself to be a very partial and an unfair Disputant ; for he hath left out of this Quotation those Words which are so material, as absolutely to alter the Sense of the Assertion ; for if the Words my Opponent hath quoted were exactly mine, without any more Addition, then I confess there would appear a very foul Contradiction to my former Assertions, *viz.* that Jesus Christ is God ; whereas these Expressions, as he hath quoted them, import a Denial thereof ; and that the Reader may judge whether he hath done me Justice, I will truly transcribe those Sentences as they are in Page 43. of my Examination, ‘ I know not of any who (asserts
 ‘ the Consubstantiality of Jesus Christ with
 ‘ God the Father) will have God to be Man,
 ‘ and Man to be God, simply and abstract-
 ‘ edly consider’d.’ The Words which he hath omitted are, *simply and abstractedly consider’d.*

And I would ask this Question of the Reader, whether there is not a manifest Difference in the Sense of this Assertion, as it stands in my Book, and as my Opponent hath quoted it ? For the Consequence of his is this, that if I allow Jesus Christ to be Man, then I deny his Being God ; and if I allow him to be God, then I deny his being Man, (he says) because I say, *Nor any who will*

will have God to be Man, and Man to be God.

But when the Words [*simply and abstractedly*] are added, then it justly infers thus; That a Man, simply and abstractedly from any Union with the Godhead, is not God; nor God, consider'd in the same, is not Man; but that when God and Man are united in one Person, that he as properly takes his Denomination from one Nature, as well as the other, and may be predicated of as God as Man, and Man as well as God, because he cannot properly be said to be a simple, but a united Being, that is to say, the Godhead united to the Manhood, and the Manhood to the Godhead.

As then the Hypothesis of this Argument is false, by an Omission of such material Words of mine, all his Anamadvensions are Words without any Foundation, and needs no other Refutation.

But, however, I think it necessary a little to take notice of his so many times asserting I make a Plurality of Gods, of which he hath not given any Proof; and it were sufficient for me only to deny it; but for the Satisfaction of the Reader, I shall make a few Observations. The Reason why (as I apprehend) he says I assert a Plnrality of God's is, because I (Scripturally) maintain Jesus Christ to be both God and Man, and that the Properties and Characters of God were ascribed to him. ¶ That these Properties and Characters could properly be ascribed unto him, if he was only a mere Man, I deny, and fixes Blasphemy on those who gave, and he who received them; or, sup-
pſing

posing him to be a Creature in the highest Exaltation, could he command as his Right the Properties of the Eternal God, could he challenge Omniscience, Omnipresence, and Omnipotence; and upon these, command Worship to be paid unto him, that Property which God hath peculiarly reserved to himself in the second Commandment, and also reassumed by Christ himself to Satan. *It is written, thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve.* Now as religious Worship belongs to God only, and that none can claim it, without being guilty of the highest Blasphemy, so it will follow, if Jesus Christ was not God, he was guilty of Blasphemy to command Worship to be paid unto him: That Worship he commanded, and was paid unto him, is evident from many Places of Scripture. It comes then properly to be consider'd, how Worship could be given to him, if he was not the One-only True and Living God, who was manifest in the Flesh: Which leads me to make these following Queries.

Query 1. * Are not the Titles, Characters, and particular Prerogatives of God, ascribed in Scripture to Jesus Christ?

Query 2. Does not the Scripture declare an intimate Union with God and Jesus Christ, *Colos. ii. 9. In him dwelleth all the Fulness*

* I acknowledge myself beholden to the Ingenious *Isaac Watts* as the Foundation of these Queries; though I have made several Alterations and Additions, which I thought necessary to my Point.

ness of the Godhead bodily, John x. 30. John xiv. 10. John xiv. 9.

Query 3. Is it impossible or irrational, that the Almighty God can unite himself to Human Nature? And will not such a Union lay a Foundation for the Properties of each Nature, to be indifferently ascribed and given?

Query 4. Is not our Lord Jesus Christ declared to be of the Seed of *David*, according to the Flesh? And is not he also asserted to be *God over all, blessed for ever?* *1 Tim. iii. 6. That he was God manifest in Flesh; and the Beginning and the End, the First and Last, the Root and Off-spring of David, Rev. xx. 13, 16.*

Query 5. Is it not asserted, *Acts xx. 28. God hath purchased the Church with his own Blood?* *John i. 3, 16. That he laid down his Life for us?* Can there be any other rational Way of accounting for these particular Attributions, than allowing the Human Nature of Christ to be united to the Divine?

Query 6. Will the allowing such a Union destroy the Unity of the Godhead, or make more Gods than one?

The whole Tenor of my Doctrine amounts to the preceding Queries.

First, That the particular Characters and Prerogatives of God are ascribed to Jesus Christ.

Secondly, That the Scripture declares an intimate Union with God the Father, and Jesus Christ his Son.

Thirdly, That Jesus Christ is of the Seed of *David*, and yet he is God over all, blessed forever, &c.

R

Fourthly,

Fourthly, Jesus Christ, the Son of God laid down his Life for Mankind, and is ascribed unto God, by virtue of the Union of the Human Nature of Jesus Christ to the Godhead, agreeable to the Text before quoted, *Acts* xx. 18. 1 *John* iii. 16.

Fifthly, That I deny it to be either impossible or irrational, that God can unite himself to Human Nature; and that such a Union lays a Foundation for the Properties of each Nature, to be indifferently ascribed.

Sixthly, That I believe there can be no other rational way of accounting for the particular Attributions to, and Assertions concerning Jesus Christ, than by allowing such a Union.

Seventhly, That the allowing such a Union doth not destroy the Unity of the Godhead, nor make more Gods than one. And to these Queries I expect (if my Opponent replies) distinct and proper Answers.

But pray wherein does my Assertions suppose a Plurality of Gods? Have I attempted to divide the Eternal God, who is infinite and indivisible? or have I asserted Jesus Christ had Abilities and Perfections to qualify him a God distinct from the Only True God? Have I pleaded that the Man Jesus (simply) was a God, and had infinite Perfections purely as a Human Being? or have I supposed or called him a God, separate from his being united to the entire Godhead? Whereas, on the contrary I plead, that God so united himself to the Humanity of Jesus Christ, as that there is a peculiar
and

and intimate Union or Oneness. And if this Union is not allowed, let *William Bromfield* shew the Title Jesus Christ had to any of the Attributes given to him, which were the incommunicable Properties of God; for then it would level him with the rest of Mankind, and he would have no more Right to the Ascription of divine Perfections, than any of the Prophets or Apostles; nay, could a Minister of State, whether in the Capacity of an Ambassador, or any other, assume the Titles of a King, without the Imputation of a Rebel; although the Power he may be invested with be ever so great, yet it is but subordinate and inferior to the Prince; and therefore should he attempt to do, or command any Thing to be done in his own Authority, without mentioning in the Name or Power of him from whom he hath his Authority, could it admit of any other Construction, than that he intended it of himself as Supream. And the Case is the same with Jesus Christ: If he was not God, would it not then have been Blasphemy in him to receive his Attributes, and to speak of himself as God? For although he was ever so largely influenced, he had no Right to assume those Titles, because his Power would be only subordinate, and received from another infinitely greater than himself, and so had not a Title to claim his Power from whom he received that he had; and therefore it was his Place to ascribe all to that Eternal God, by whom he was only assisted to do what he did, as did the Prophets: They did not say,

I and my Father are one ; that they had all Power in Heaven and in Earth ; that where two or three were gathered together in their Names, they would be in the midst of them.

All these Jesus Christ asserted of himself ; but the Prophets, when they spoke, it was with an emphatical Distinction ; *Thus saith the Lord ; the Lord spake unto Moses, saying, speak so and so.* Hence it is evident they made a plain Distinction between themselves and God, as being only influenced and assisted to perform his Will. Moreover, the Apostles were so careful and anxious of taking any of the Glory due unto God, that they would not suffer Homage or Obeisance to be paid unto them ; *For when the Priests of Jupiter brought * Oxen and Garlands into the Gates, and would have done Sacrifice with the People ; which when the Apostles, Barnabas and Paul, heard, they rent their Cloaths, and ran among the People, crying out, and saying, Sirs, why do ye these Things, we are also Men of like Passions with you, and preach unto you, that ye should turn from these Vanities unto the living God.*

Now it is evident that these Apostles, notwithstanding they were largely influenced by the Power and Spirit of God, and spoke in his Name, yet they would not by virtue of that, suffer Worship to be paid unto them, as knowing it was the incommunicable Property of God.

And it is also as plain, that Jesus Christ did receive Worship : If my Opponent will say that Worship was given unto him, by virtue of his being influenced by the Spirit of God, it will
not

* The Manner of Worship with them.

not be to the Purpose ; for then, by the same Rule, the Apostles, and every Man who stands in the like Capacity, may be worshipped. And whether this would not be Idolatry, I leave to the Reader's Judgment.

William Bromfield must allow that Jesus Christ did receive Worship, or deny it ; if he allows he did, then he must shew what Property he had to it, as a mere Man ; if he will not allow it, then he must deny the Scriptures, which assert he did.

The Authority by which he received it must be his own, arising from the Nature of the Union before observed ; or that he received it by virtue of a divine Influence by the former, his Authority was valid by the latter, he had no more Title than the Apostles. Admitting that the Influence was greater than the Apostles, that alters not the Case ; for the greatest Degrees of divine Influence or divine Knowledge no more gives a Title to be worshipped, than the smallest ; for the Subject to whom it is dispensed is the same.

But I consider I have said enough to this Particular, and equally militates against his Observations on Page 46. as it doth against Page 40. and therefore I shall proceed to make some short Observations on Page 47. where my Opponent says, *That if Henton Brown will bring all his Mystery of the Man Jesus into the Word, or the Word in him, no body will dispute.*

Now, if I could but tell what he means by bringing the Man Jesus into the Word, I might give a suitable Answer : If by the Word he means God ; and by bringing the Man Jesus into him, he means their
being

being essentially united, I agree with him ; but then it would contradict all his former Assertions ; for such a Union necessarily supposes him more than Man ; for Unity expresses Oneness ; and when the Properties of two Natures are so united to each other, then in whatsoever Being those Natures are so united, that Being properly takes it Denomination from either Nature, as I have divers times observed : So that if by his Words he intends, as I have before expressed, then he must allow the Divinity of Jesus Christ in the manner as the Scripture declare, and I have maintained. But yet a little further he says, when *he speaks of the Eternal Spirit, the Word, the Power, and Grace, he says that was and is God, which was in the Man Jesus, the Prophet like unto Moses.*

Now these Words result in his former Assertions, viz. that Jesus Christ was no more than a mortal Man. For the Words [Power and Grace] imply no more than an Influence of God in the Man Jesus, which he says was and is God. And so he may say that the Word [Power and Grace] was and is God, that was in the Apostle *Paul*, and the rest of the Apostles, and all the faithful Servants of God. But then pray how could the Attributes of God be given to Jesus Christ, any more than to the Apostles ? And how could these Things be predicated of him ?

*That he knew no Sin ; Guile was not found in his Mouth ; he was made like unto us in all Things, Sin only ~~accepted~~. *excepted**

Now can it be said of any mere Man, that Guile was not found in his Mouth ; that he knew

knew no Sin ; that he is as a Lamb without Spot or Blemish ? Was there ever any mere Man, since the Fall, to whom Sin hath not been imputed ? Can Jesus Christ be a Natural Son of the first *Adam*, and yet be asserted of him he knew no Sin ? May it be predicated of him, that he is *the second Man, the Lord from Heaven*, and yet at the same time be the natural Son of the first *Adam* ? How can these Things be ? Again, if he was only a mere Man, how could *David* call him Lord ? Which Question was put by Christ himself. *If Christ is David's Son, how then doth David call him Lord ?* *David* was not only a King, and in the Possession of his Kingdom, but also a Prophet of the Lord, and one whom God had peculiarly favoured ; and yet this *David* calls Christ, (who was declared to be his Son) his Lord : Can then Jesus Christ, if he was no more than a Prophet, be *David's* Lord, who was both King and Prophet ? Is there any Lordship among the Prophets of the Most High ? Can one Man, influenced by the Spirit of God, be Lord of another by the same Influence ? If not, then how is Jesus *David's* Lord, who was his Son ?

I come now to Page 44. of *William Bromfield's* Reply, where I meet with an Answer to a Question propounded to him in Page 47. of my Examination, which is as follows :
 ' Nay, should I ask *William Bromfield*, who acknowledges to the Title of a Doctor in
 ' Physick, and so no doubt is skill'd in the
 ' Nature and Causes of Things, I say, should
 ' I demand a philosophical Reason how it
 came

‘ came to pass that *Elizabeth* conceived with
 ‘ Child, notwithstanding she had been ever
 ‘ barren till then, and then according to the
 ‘ Course of Nature by Age, was past the
 ‘ time of Child-bearing ?

The Reason of my asking this Question was, because my Opponent would not allow Jesus to be conceived without the Assistance of *Joseph*, as being irrational, and contrary to the Course of Nature; and as the Conception of *Elizabeth* was contrary to the Course of Nature, then I urge, Why is one more Irrational, than the other ?

But I shall give his Answer at large ; by which the Reader may apprehend that it fully answers the Purpose for which I intended it.

And as for Henton Brown's asking William Bromfield a Philosophical Reason of Elizabeth's conceiving, I think the best Answer is the Truth, which is true Wisdom ; and that true Philosophy, which is by the same Reason, Sarah, Abrahams's Wife, conceived in her old Age, is sufficient to this ignorant Man ; for God Almighty, who has all Power in Heaven and in Earth, and gave Fruitfulness and Conception to Rebecca, Isaac's Wife, at his Request, and to Hannah, the Mother of Samuel the Prophet, who were barren Women, could and did do it to Elizabeth ; and yet this is not irrational, as the other seems to be to me. And this I think is a definitive Answer to his foolish Question.

I acknowledge that his Answer is as much to my Purpose, as any he could have invented ; had I writ it myself for him to Sign, I could not have writ any thing more

more to strengthen my Argument ; for here he places the Omnipotence of God, to supply the Defect of Nature.

But they, (says William Bromfield) conceived by the immediate Omnipotence of God, who could and did give Conception the very same that I plead in the Conception of Mary ; for he who was able to cause those barren and aged Women to conceive, contrary to the Course of Nature by Mediums, which Mediums were their Husbands, so was he likewise able to give Conception to Mary, without any such Medium. And pray why doth one appear to be more irrational than the other ? For if two such Things were to happen now, that a Woman of Seventy six, who had been ever barren, should conceive a Child, and a Virgin, who never knew a Man, should likewise conceive, would they not be look'd upon as Miracles ? and would not one call for Admiration as well as the other ? For there is no more rational Account to be given for the one, than for the other ; and so must both centre in the Omnipotence of God ; and if both were equally attested for Truth, for what Reason should we believe and allow the one, and disbelieve and explode the other, unless that we plead the one is out of the Reach of God's Omnipotence ? Which would be very absurd, because Omnipotence supposes a Property in a Being, who is capable to do every Thing ; to him nothing is impossible ; which was asserted by the Angel, who was the Messenger of the Tidings to Mary ; For with God nothing is

S impos.

impossible. But why is it a foolish Question to ask a Reason why one Thing must be allowed, which can't be accounted for, any more than another? For he hath not given any other definitive Answer, than what I pleaded in the other. For *Mary's* Conception by the Holy Ghost, (without natural Means,) is as fully asserted in Scripture, as either of the Persons before-mentioned with those Means. So that I may turn the Question upon him thus; If God, who has all Power in Heaven and Earth, could give Fruitfulness and Conception to these Barren Women, contrary to the physical Cause of Things, why could not the same Omnipotent God give Conception to a Virgin, without the physical Cause of Conception: If my Opponent will deny it, then with better Reason, (as he says,) mine was a foolish Question, I may say his is a foolish Answer.

I proceed to Page 47. where my Opponent still will have it, that Jesus Christ was no more than a Prophet, like unto *Moses*. But forasmuch as I have swell'd this Defence to a greater Bulk than at first was my Design; and having pretty fully consider'd his several Assertions, I shall now be as concise as possible, intending speedily to draw to a Conclusion.

But it gives me a very great Suspicion, that either he seldom reads the Scripture, or that he wilfully disregards them; for they do very amply set forth the transcendent Excellency of Jesus Christ to *Moses*, particularly *Hebrews* iii. 3, 4, 5, 6. *He is counted worthy*

thy of more Glory than Moses, in as much as he who hath builded the House, hath more Honour than the House; for every House is builded by some Man, but he who built all Things is God. And Moses verily was faithful in all his House, as a Servant, for a Testimony of those Things which were to be spoken after; but Christ as a Son over his own House, whose ye are.

Here then is excellently described the surpassing Glory of Jesus Christ to Moses, because he hath built the House, and is faithful as a Son over it; not as a Servant, as was Moses, but as a Son.

* This House is no other than the Church for the Living God; whereof, as he is the only Lord, so is he also properly the only Builder. He then who is the Lord and Builder of the Church, must be more than Moses, who only was a Member and a Servant of it.

But my Opponent is displeased for my making use of the Words [Godhead and Manhood,] he indeed hath it [Godhood.] And whether it is an Error of the Press, or his own, I cannot tell; but sure I am, I never made use of any such Term as [Godhood]; nor do I remember I ever saw it in any of the Crafty Priest's Writings, (as he calls them.) But for Godhead I used, and if this fine Expression be the product of *Babylon*, I learnt it first from the Scripture, and I am sure it is to be found there still.

And as to the other fine Expression, as he calls it, which is [Manhood]; if that is the product of *Babylon* also, then I find my Opponent hath forgot himself; although he

S 2

says

* *Usher's* Body of Divinity. Incarnation of the Son of God.

says, *He never went back into Babylon for any Thing*: But then pray how come he to make Use of this *Babylonish* Expression? Hath not he made himself a Criminal by his own Words? For if the Reader will turn back to Page 31. of his Reply, he will find there that he uses it without any Difficulty; and so if he will have these fine Expressions of Godhead and Manhood to be the Product of *Babylon*, and her crafty Priests, then he must accuse the Apostle *Paul* of being one, seeing he makes use of one of these Expressions; and likewise he must acknowledge he hath joined himself with them, by making use of the other

My Opponent, Page 48. still insists that *Jesus Christ* was not deified after the Resurrection, although he hath not maintained it in any other Manner than in his former Book, which is *John xx. 1.* And it were sufficient for me to oppose the Testimony of *Thomas*, which is so very express against him: But that I intend to leave him no room to cavil, the Words he quotes are these, *I ascend to my Father, and your Father, to my God and your God*; and then proceeds, *So that unless People will have a Plurality of Gods, they must own and confess, there is but One-only True God, and Jesus Christ the Eternal Spirit.*

In the first Place I observe, that I have constantly pleaded that *Jesus Christ* was God and Man, in two proper and distinct Natures; the one Divine, the other Human; and that he speaks of himself at different Times, with regard to each of those Natures;
some-

sometimes he speaks and represents himself as Son of Man, and at other Times as Son of God, the divine Word, and makes use of such Terms of Speech as is most agreeable to represent each Nature, intending thereby more effectually to reach the Understandings of his Hearers: And thus it was with regard to these Expressions: *I ascend to my Father and your Father, to my God and your God.* Thus he speaks as Son of Man, regarding strictly his human Nature; for in that Sense God is his Father; and as he was his Father, so in the same Manner was he his God. And thus the Solution of this Point is agreeable to Scripture; for by those Expressions he did not exclude himself from being united to the Godhead, nor from receiving the Attributions of the Almighty, as appears by the Confession of *Thomas*, who was so incredulous that he would not believe, *Except, (says he,) John xx. 25. I shall see in his Hands the Print of his Nails, and put my Finger into the Print of his Nails, and thrust my Hand into his Side, I will not believe.*

But what so soon convinced him? Was not he immediately with some certain Evidence? Infomuch, he cried in such an emphatick and affectionate a Manner, MY LORD, MY GOD. Several other Instances there are which proves his Divinity after his Resurrection; as particularly his coming in among the Disciples, when the Doors were shut, and shewed himself to them divers Times in a wonderful Manner; all which is sufficient to convince every Christian of his Divinity,

vinity, and thereby overthrow *William Bromfield's* Assertions. But observe, he will have all People own and confess there is but one only true and living God, how comes it then that he owns two? For he speaks of Jesus Christ the eternal Spirit, besides the one true and living God; for the one true God is the eternal Spirit: Then what doth he mean by another eternal Spirit, which he calls Jesus Christ, besides the one true and living God?

Having now gone through the several Parts of *William Bromfield's* Reply, which chiefly contains the Matters I proposed to consider; and as I am not willing to swell this Defence to a greater Bulk than is absolutely necessary, so I shall draw to a Conclusion, hoping I have sufficiently manifested to the Reader;

First, That notwithstanding *William Bromfield* hath insinuated his erroneous Faith to be that of the primitive Quakers, it was not so, as will appear by the Minute herewith publish'd; and that he himself, although he pretends to be one of the most primitive, yet he manifests himself not to be one, by his using these Phrases of Speech, as namely, his * Majesty, his Grace, my Lord, Sir, Mr. Madam; all which Titles the primitive and modern Quakers equally disclaimed, which

* I am not going about to ascertain the precise Ideas for these Terms, but to shew that the Quakers equally disuse them; so *William Bromfield* in that Respect hath manifested himself not to be one.

which *William Bromfield* hath frequently, and without any Hesitation, used in his Book called the *Faith of a true Christian*.

Secondly, That Jesus Christ was not the real Son of *Joseph*, as *William Bromfield* hath asserted; but that, according to the Prophecies of the Prophets, and the Testimonies of the Evangelists, he was really the Son of God, conceived in the Womb of the Virgin *Mary* by the Holy Ghost.

Thirdly, That by the Agreement and Concurrence of the Prophets, in their Prophecies concerning Jesus Christ, with the rest of the Evangelists, with the Evangelist *Matthew* that the first of his Chapters, from the seventeenth Verse to the End, is not irrational, and to be rejected, as such as *William Bromfield* hath suggested.

Fourthly, That Jesus was the Son of *David* by *Mary* his Mother; forasmuch, I have shewn in divers Places she was of the House of *David*.

Lastly, That Jesus Christ was God and Man by a most miraculous Union of the divine and human Natures; and that by virtue of this Union he was as properly called God as Man, and Man as well as God, and hath the Properties and Actions of each Nature ascribed to him.

And as this Doctrine is so evidently confirmed in the Scriptures; and without the Belief of which we must destroy the Authority of Scripture, and at the same time the Foundation of our Hope, which we have in Jesus Christ; so it behoveth every Christian, according to the

the Light and Understanding God hath given them, solidly to enquire into the Nature of their Faith in God and Christ: First by his assuming the Nature of Man, and what he did effect for us, by offering up himself a Sacrifice to God the Father; and, secondly, in that most glorious and inward Manifestation of his Spirit in the Hearts of Men, by which they may see themselves in their fallen and depraved Nature, and which enables them, as they follow the Leading thereof, to come out of that which is the Cause of Separation from God: These were the Ends and Purposes for which God sent his beloved Son out of the Bosom of his Mercy and Goodness, to suffer Death for Mankind, and thereby to make Reconciliation to God, who was offended by Man's Disobedience, and that he should be a Leader and Guider unto Men, by appearing spiritually in their Hearts: He should be their King and Law-giver, and be the Prince and Captain, whom they were to obey and follow; and those only, who, by vertue of this inward Manifestation, obey and follow the Lord Jesus, shall reap the blessed Effects of his Death and Sufferings; these will be presented to his Father, who have washed their Robes, and made them white in his Blood: Let us seek therefore to be acquainted more and more with his divine and holy Spirit, that by it we may be thus washed and cleansed from the Defilements of Sin; that we may have that welcome Sentence of the blessed Jesus, when we shall be summoned from Time into Eternity.

nity, of, *Come ye Blessed of my Father, receive the Kingdom prepared for you before the Foundations of the World were laid*; and that this may be the State of every one, I pray the Lord Almighty, by his Power and Spirit, to move so upon the Hearts of all Mankind, as to dispose them to seek after him, who will be found of those who seek him aright; and when they find him, they find Salvation to themselves: He is the Joy and Life of the Soul of Man, in whom alone Man's Happiness is, who is the King eternal, immortal, invisible, the only wise God; to whom be Honour and Glory for ever and ever. *Amen.*



T

POST.



POSTSCRIPT.



URSUA NT to the Expectation I gave the Reader in the Preface, I have here subjoined a Minute of that Meeting to which *William Bromfield* appealed for the Truth of his Doctrine and Assertion, that it was the Faith of the primitive Quakers ; which Minute I publish by the Knowledge and Consent of the said Meeting, and is as follows, viz.

*At a Meeting of Ministers in London,
November 13. 1727.*

UPON considering *William Bromfield's* Book, entitled, the *Faith of a true Christian, and the primitive Quakers Faith*, &c. wherein he asserts Jesus to be the real Son of *Joseph*, and in his Reply to *Henton Brown* insists on the same gross Error, as the Faith of our primitive Friends,

This

This M E E T I N G

Declares they find no Footsteps of any such Doctrine in any of their Writings; but that on the contrary, their written Labours abundantly shew they believed him to be the Son of God, conceived by the Holy Ghost, and born of the Virgin *Mary*; as we also believe, and as is related by *Matthew* i. from the seventeenth Verse to the End, and *Luke* i. from the twenty fifth Verse to the thirty ninth.

F I N I S.



I beg Leave to make one Correction in the last Paragraph of the third Section in my *Examination*, where it is said *may not verify the Doctrine of St. Peter*; the Reader is desired to read it, *may not verify the Words of St. Peter*.



ERRATA.

PAGE 5. Line 33. read *I doubt not*; p. 6. l. 34. r. *an Indication*; p. 15. l. 14. r. *to be abode by*; p. 44. l. 4. r. *Descent*; p. 60. l. 34. dele the [,] at him, and put it at *so*; p. 85. l. 9. r. *my making*; p. 106. l. 1. r. *Words*; p. 113. l. 23. r. *Reference, for Relation*; p. 116. l. 1. r. *Pronoun I*; p. 119. l. 4. r. *be raised*.



90093011

